

Charles W. Munsinger to be postmaster at Coscob, in the county of Fairfield and State of Connecticut.

FLORIDA.

Louis C. Lynch to be postmaster at Gainesville, in the county of Alachua and State of Florida.

IDAHO.

Julia Connors to be postmaster at Mullan, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho.

Fred Evans to be postmaster at Burke, in the county of Shoshone and State of Idaho.

W. H. Greenhow to be postmaster at Twin Falls, in the county of Cassia and State of Idaho.

ILLINOIS.

James O. Burton to be postmaster at Dahlgren, in the county of Hamilton and State of Illinois.

James S. Courtright to be postmaster at Normal, in the county of McLean and State of Illinois.

Charles S. Randolph to be postmaster at Ipava, in the county of Fulton and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

John C. Fudge to be postmaster at Dunkirk, in the county of Jay and State of Indiana.

William H. Gostlin to be postmaster at Hammond, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

Omer Guyton to be postmaster at Cambridge City, in the county of Wayne and State of Indiana.

Winfield S. Keith to be postmaster at Bicknell, in the county of Knox and State of Indiana.

Andrew Morrissey to be postmaster at Notre Dame, in the county of St. Joseph and State of Indiana.

William E. Netherton to be postmaster at Winamac, in the county of Pulaski and State of Indiana.

INDIAN TERRITORY.

W. H. Harrison to be postmaster at Poteau, District 14, Ind. T.

IOWA.

John W. Burns to be postmaster at Keosauqua, in the county of Van Buren and State of Iowa.

James C. Dinwiddie to be postmaster at Marengo, in the county of Iowa and State of Iowa.

S. G. Goldthwaite to be postmaster at Boone, in the county of Boone and State of Iowa.

Walter F. Hall to be postmaster at Columbus Junction, in the county of Louisa and State of Iowa.

C. E. Haverly to be postmaster at Ames, in the county of Story and State of Iowa.

A. F. Morse to be postmaster at Newell, in the county of Buena Vista and State of Iowa.

Sherman F. Myers to be postmaster at Anita, in the county of Cass and State of Iowa.

Robert B. Oldham to be postmaster at Greenfield, in the county of Adair and State of Iowa.

Malcolm Peterson to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Calhoun and State of Iowa.

Minnie A. Phoenix to be postmaster at Ruthven, in the county of Palo Alto and State of Iowa.

William G. Ray to be postmaster at Grinnell, in the county of Poweshiek and State of Iowa.

Adelbert J. Weeks to be postmaster at Correctionville, in the county of Woodbury and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

Jacob B. Callen to be postmaster at Junction City, in the county of Geary and State of Kansas.

Herbert Caveness to be postmaster at Chanute, in the county of Neosho and State of Kansas.

MAINE.

Edward Brown to be postmaster at Thomaston, in the county of Knox and State of Maine.

Samuel F. Davis to be postmaster at South Paris, in the county of Oxford and State of Maine.

Frank L. Field to be postmaster at Belfast, in the county of Waldo and State of Maine.

William M. Stuart to be postmaster at Newport, in the county of Penobscot and State of Maine.

Abraham L. Wallace to be postmaster at Millbridge, in the county of Washington and State of Maine.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Althamer E. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Holliston, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Elbridge Nash to be postmaster at South Weymouth, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

David D. Streeter to be postmaster at Mount Hermon, in the county of Franklin and State of Massachusetts.

MICHIGAN.

James W. Bedell to be postmaster at Wakefield, in the county of Gogebic and State of Michigan.

Margaret Duncan to be postmaster at Au Sable, in the county of Iosco and State of Michigan.

Josephus C. Mustard to be postmaster at Scottville, in the county of Mason and State of Michigan.

C. Guy Perry to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

Leonard M. Sellers to be postmaster at Cedar Springs, in the county of Kent and State of Michigan.

MINNESOTA.

William D. Hale to be postmaster at Minneapolis, in the county of Hennepin and State of Minnesota.

Frank H. Kratka to be postmaster at Thief River Falls, in the county of Red Lake and State of Minnesota.

A. O. Lea to be postmaster at New Richland, in the county of Waseca and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Andrew J. Seibert to be postmaster at Ste. Genevieve, in the county of Ste. Genevieve and State of Missouri.

NEBRASKA.

Frank McCartney to be postmaster at Nebraska City, in the county of Otoe and State of Nebraska.

William A. Price to be postmaster at Laurel, in the county of Cedar and State of Nebraska.

Edward B. Richardson to be postmaster at Ulysses, in the county of Butler and State of Nebraska.

NEW YORK.

George D. Genung to be postmaster at Waverly, in the county of Tioga and State of New York.

James M. Pitkin to be postmaster at Newark, in the county of Wayne and State of New York.

Minnie N. Slaughter to be postmaster at Tottenville, in the county of Richmond and State of New York.

Eugene Vreeland to be postmaster at Dundee, in the county of Yates and State of New York.

NORTH DAKOTA.

Chris Fuoter to be postmaster at Ray, in the county of Williams and State of North Dakota.

OKLAHOMA.

George Y. Walbright to be postmaster at Stroud, in the county of Lincoln and Territory of Oklahoma.

PENNSYLVANIA.

James C. Jacobs to be postmaster at Burnham, in the county of Mifflin and State of Pennsylvania.

George W. McCauslin to be postmaster at Narberth, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

Nora L. Pickering to be postmaster at Peckville, in the county of Lackawanna and State of Pennsylvania.

VIRGINIA.

Annie G. Davenport to be postmaster at Gordonsville, in the county of Orange and State of Virginia.

WEST VIRGINIA.

George E. Work to be postmaster at Sistersville, in the county of Tyler and State of West Virginia.

RECIPROCAL PROTECTION OF PATENTS WITH GUATEMALA.

The injunction of secrecy was removed December 13, 1906, from a convention between the United States and the Republic of Guatemala for the reciprocal protection of patents, signed at Guatemala city on November 10, 1906.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, December 13, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HON. ERNEST M. POLLARD.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska offers the following resolution as a matter of privilege. The Clerk will report the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas on July 18, 1905, ERNEST M. POLLARD was elected to fill the vacancy in the Fifty-ninth Congress caused by the resignation of Hon. E. J. BURKETT; and

Whereas the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Representatives paid

ERNEST M. POLLARD for the period intervening between March 4, 1905, the beginning of the Fifty-ninth Congress, and July 18, 1905, the date of his election thereto; and

Whereas Mr. POLLARD's legal right to receive pay for this period has been questioned and his action in accepting it has been severely criticised by certain parties; and

Whereas section 51 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, under which payment was made, has never been construed by the courts in a case exactly like this: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives, That this whole matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee of the House with instructions to investigate the legal questions involved and report its conclusions to this House before the termination of the present Congress.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the resolution was agreed to.

INVESTIGATION OF PRICES OF LUMBER.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up resolution No. 652, and ask unanimous consent for that privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution No. 652.

Resolved, That the Secretary of Commerce and Labor be, and is hereby, requested to investigate the cause of the high prices of lumber in the various stages of manufacture, and the said investigation shall be conducted with the particular object of ascertaining whether or not these high prices have resulted in whole or in part from any contract, agreement, or combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of commerce among the several States and Territories or with foreign countries; also whether the said prices have been manipulated in whole or in part by any corporation, joint stock company, or corporate combination engaged in commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, and if so, to investigate the organization, capitalization, profits, conduct and management of the business of such corporations, companies, or corporate combinations, and make early report of his findings according to law.

To carry out and give effect to the provisions of the resolution the Secretary shall have power to issue subpoenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, require the production of books and papers, and receive depositions taken before any proper officers in any State in the United States.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands this is a request to discharge the Committee on the Judiciary from the further consideration of the resolution and to consider it in the House at this time. Is there objection?

Mr. DE ARMOND. What resolution is that?

The SPEAKER. The resolution which has just been read. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman a question? I do not object to the consideration of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands there is no objection to the consideration. Does the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to know what provision is made in the resolution to pay the expenses of this investigation, or whether there is a fund provided by law for the Secretary of Commerce and Labor to pay the expense of having this investigation made? In other words, it would be useless to pass a resolution directing the investigation to be made, witnesses to be summoned, and testimony taken if money is not provided for it. I did not hear read any provision in the resolution providing money for the investigation.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's question, if I get it correctly, there is no question about the fund to carry out this investigation, and the House, I think, is exceedingly anxious that an investigation of this kind should be made, at least the country is, and we are exceedingly anxious to get it passed just as soon as possible so that this investigation may be commenced.

Mr. BARTLETT. If the gentleman will permit me to say, I do not object to it. I am as much in favor of an investigation as anyone, and I hope the resolution will be passed. The gentleman misunderstands me. He thinks I am opposing the resolution and I am not. I am merely suggesting to the gentleman that in undertaking to provide for the investigation there ought to be means provided for the purpose of doing it completely. You remember the President returned a like resolution in respect to the oil investigation and the coal investigation to the House with the suggestion they had not provided funds for the purpose of carrying on the investigation, and if this resolution needs such an amendment providing for a fund I think the gentleman ought to provide for it, and for one I will vote for it.

Mr. MILLER. As far as the question of money for the purpose of carrying out the investigation is concerned, if they have not a sufficient fund on hand it will be immediately provided for by an appropriation, and I think the gentleman will agree

heartily with me, as far as the subject-matter is concerned, that it ought to be passed, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I caught the reading of the resolution it applies only to manufacturers of lumber. Now, I think it should read so as to cover the wholesale and retail dealers also, and if in the first case it does not include them it should be amended so as to include wholesale and retail dealers as well as manufacturers.

Mr. MILLER. In my judgment, Mr. Speaker, the whole field will be covered by the language of this resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I would like to have the resolution read again.

Mr. MILLER. It is the question of the high price of lumber through all the stages of its production, and it is sufficiently broad to cover that entire question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not believe that the language is broad enough to cover the wholesalers and retailers.

Mr. MILLER. I want to say to the gentleman that this resolution was referred by the Judiciary Committee to the Department of Commerce and Labor for its views upon the subject, and they have reported back to that committee.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Has the gentleman any objection to amending the resolution?

Mr. MILLER. I would have no objection to that; no. But I think it is sufficiently broad to include all dealers in lumber.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I ask that for this reason, that many of the mill owners state that the price of lumber has not been raised by them, but that it has been raised entirely by the wholesale dealer and the retail dealer. If they are the guilty ones, we ought to amend the resolution. I ask that the resolution be read again.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] yield for an inquiry?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman have any objection to amending his resolution so as to ascertain whether or no the present high price of lumber is due in any degree to the present very high prices that the Government is demanding for stumpage of its timber on the forest reserves?

Mr. MILLER. I will answer that question, Mr. Speaker, and I will say again that in my judgment the resolution is broad enough to cover that whole question.

Mr. GILBERT and Mr. HEPBURN rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] yield?

Mr. MILLER. To the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that his resolution only refers to the manufacture of lumber in its various stages; that it will have no application whatever to the dealer, either wholesale or retail, after it leaves the manufacturer's hands, and it is the contention on the part of dealers, at least, that the high price of lumber is owing to combinations among the manufacturers, while they in turn say that it results from these combinations among the dealers. Now, it seems to me the resolution ought to be modified. This resolution was sent to the Committee on the Judiciary. I suppose that they failed to report it because they recognized the fact that it was not a subject properly before them. If it had been sent to the proper committee, it would have been reported upon long ago and in proper shape.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Iowa I desire to state that the Committee on the Judiciary has not reported this resolution for the reason that they have not been able to hold a meeting of that committee for the purpose of considering this question, and I am informed now by a member of that committee, the chairman of it, that the probabilities are they will not have another meeting until after the holidays. That is why I asked this morning for unanimous consent to call up this resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the resolution be read.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Clerk read the resolution?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] wish the resolution to be read in his time?

Mr. PAYNE. I hope the gentleman from Kansas will let the resolution be read in his time.

Mr. MILLER. I would like to have the resolution read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution the second time.

The resolution was again read.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, if the gentleman will yield a minute, I want to suggest that we add, after the words "various stages of manufacture," the words "purchase and sale," and then you will cover the points which have been raised.

Mr. MILLER. I am willing to accept that amendment—that,

after the word "manufacture," in line 3, page 1, the words "and sale" be inserted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "manufacture," insert the words "and sale."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, on page 2, as I find upon examination of the law on the subject that they are not necessary. The Secretary now has ample power under the law as it exists.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2 strike out all of lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Has unanimous consent been given for present consideration?

The SPEAKER. It has.

Mr. MANN. Then I would like a moment's time.

Mr. MILLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to call the attention of the House to these resolutions for this reason: A resolution somewhat similar to this one went through the House a year or two ago, introduced by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN], and, as a result of it, it was held by the Federal courts that the beef trust, so called, could not be prosecuted. No one knows just how far an inquiry of this sort might go, and while I have no objection to a proper resolution upon subjects of this kind, it is a very poor legislative method to pass a resolution involving so much without the consideration of the proper committee of the House.

The Judiciary Committee may have given consideration to this subject, but we have no reports from that committee before the House. If the Secretary of Commerce and Labor should desire in his inquiry, or any of his subordinates without desire, should call upon these people to testify under subpoena, all prosecution of them would be ended. The very purpose of resolutions of this kind should be not to excuse the persons who are guilty, but to punish the persons who are guilty. We already have under the railroad-rate law that was passed at the last session of Congress—under a little amendment which was put in from the best of motives—the probability that the Standard Oil Company and its agents will escape conviction, because of the little harmless amendment inserted in that bill from the best of motives. I think that these matters ought to receive consideration by the committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, the fears of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] as to any immunity resulting from this investigation or others like it are not well founded. Of course the courts of the United States have been at variance on the interpretation of similar investigations, but at the last session of Congress we passed a law interpreting all of our statutes relating to such investigations, making it impossible in the future to grant immunity to parties examined in these investigations, and making it apply only to cases where parties are called and compelled to testify against their interest in courts. So far as an investigation of the meat trust is concerned, there was no necessity for getting into the position of that investigation of granting immunity to anyone, because it was not necessary to call officers of the suspected corporations upon subjects of that character. Of course, lawyers, I think, agree all over the country that the interpretation placed on the law by Judge Humphrey, as the result of that investigation, was, perhaps, a stretch of the law and not warranted. At all events, subsequent legislation has settled that question so that we can with propriety direct as a House, as well as the Senate can direct as a separate body, investigations in this class of cases. I think we can with propriety direct investigations of this character without the fear suggested by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me—

Mr. MILLER. I will yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. If I remember, the gentleman was of the same impression about his own resolution. He and I discussed it several times before I consented that the House should take it up by unanimous consent. He was equally confident that his resolution could under no circumstances permit the people engaged in the claimed conspiracy of the beef trust to get out, while I had suspicion that it might have that result.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I will call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that all subsequent inves-

tigations of the Standard Oil, the coal trust, and other combinations have been made under resolutions following precisely the language of the one referred to, and the Department has steered clear of the complications which I think they unwittingly allowed themselves to be drawn into in the beef-trust investigation, which was the first of the kind.

Mr. MANN. It remains to be determined whether they have or not. They have not tried those cases in court yet.

Mr. MARTIN. Very well; but I think we have covered the whole subject now by legislation, so that I think there will be no danger in the future.

Mr. MANN. But I do not think we have.

Mr. MARTIN. At all events, there is nothing in that suggestion that would, I think, make it reasonable that this House should hesitate in its effort to arrive at the facts regarding any of these great combinations which are oppressing the country. Certainly the administrative officers of the Government have had their eyes sufficiently opened now to proceed with due caution in their investigations, and I have no doubt they will do so.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, Mr. Speaker, in the last session of Congress, as I stated before, in the railroad rate bill, there was a provision put in the law stating that although there was a repeal of conflicting statutes, that repeal should not affect prosecutions then pending in court, and it was assumed in the House that that would cover all cases of violation of the law previous to that date. Now, the Standard Oil people have been indicted for violations of section 1 of the Elkins law, which it is assumed has been repealed by the interstate-commerce law, and this little harmless provision of law providing that the repeal should not affect prosecutions pending in court is now said itself to that extent to repeal the general provision of the statute providing that a repeal shall not affect any prosecution, and to exempt the Standard Oil people from prosecution for offenses where they were not pending in court at the time of the passage of the railroad rate act, leaving them out from prosecution for all offenses previous to the time of the passage of the railroad rate act. It is just such harmless things that creep into legislation without proper consideration by a committee which defeat the ends of justice and prevent the prosecution of these men engaged in these combinations; and it seems to me a violent presumption to think that a resolution brought in here without consideration by a committee is equally guarded with one considered by the great Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I think the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] upon the subject of the repeal clause in the railroad rate bill hardly germane to the present discussion. Here is a resolution that now comes in proper form before this House for consideration. It is upon a matter of vital importance. The investigation ought to be had. Anyone familiar with the subject knows that the great advances in lumber over the country during the past five years have been so enormous as to properly attract the attention of the legislative branch of this Government and to demand an investigation. I think the resolution is in the form that we have adopted time and again in substance, and I think we can safely proceed to its passage at this time.

Mr. MILLER. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, whether carefully digested by its author or not—and I take it that it has been—does not cover what might be called the "log trust." It provides for the high prices of lumber in the various stages of manufacture. It seems to me that it may be made a broader and a better resolution if it would apply also to timber and logs and lumber, etc. I suggest something of that sort.

Mr. BANNON. Is not a log in process of manufacture as soon as it is cut from the tree?

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I am coming to that. Suppose these great concerns have bought in bulk, as they have done, great counties of trees fit for lumber, and they hold that timber there and put it on the market when they choose, and put up the price when they choose, when it is in the tree, and when it is in the log, and before it is manufactured into lumber—before it is lumber at all. I think if this matter be referred to the Judiciary Committee or to the Committee on Commerce, with directions to report a bill back here in three or four days, we can get a better resolution than this, though I shall vote for this.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the remarks of the

gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], I think perhaps I owe the House an explanation. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Illinois to the fact that this resolution was introduced into the House on the 10th of this month. Immediately upon its being received by the Committee on the Judiciary I sent a copy of the resolution to the Department of Commerce and Labor, with a letter. I have not yet had a reply to that communication, but just a few moments ago the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MILLER] submitted to me a letter addressed to myself from the Department of Commerce and Labor with reference to this subject. Now, the gentleman will see from my statement that it has been absolutely impossible for the Committee on the Judiciary to consider this resolution. We did not feel like taking it up until we had heard from the Department of Commerce and Labor. I will now ask the Clerk to read in my time the letter from the Department of Commerce and Labor which was handed to me by the gentleman from Kansas and which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR,
BUREAU OF CORPORATIONS,
Washington, December 13, 1906.

Hon. JOHN J. JENKINS,
Chairman Judiciary Committee, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: By telephone conversation with Congressman MILLER yesterday I understand that both he and you desire expression of opinion from this Bureau upon House resolution No. 652, December 10, 1906, requesting investigation of the lumber industry by the Secretary of Commerce and Labor.

In reply thereto allow me to make a suggestion that lines 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, on page 2, beginning with the words "to carry out" and ending with the words "United States," be stricken out entirely, for the reason that the organic act of this Department now gives the Commissioner of Corporations power to issue such subpoenas, administer oaths, etc., as set forth in the said five lines. There is, therefore, no need to give this power in the said resolution. Furthermore, the said powers in the organic act and the results of the exercise thereof have been carefully defined by "the act defining immunity of witnesses," etc., approved June 30, 1906, with the purpose of clearly determining all questions of immunity which might arise under the powers given the Commissioner.

Should the said lines referred to remain in the said resolution it is obvious that further questions might arise on this question of immunity.

Very respectfully,

HERBERT KNOX SMITH,
Deputy Commissioner.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I call for a vote on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. MILLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN COAL LANDS.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I present for consideration a privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution No. 643.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the House of Representatives a full and complete description of all public lands which have been withdrawn or reserved from entry, filing, or selection since the 1st day of July, 1906, together with a report as to the reasons for the said withdrawals and reservations, and as to the character of the same, and the present status of the lands relative to entry, filing, and selection under the land laws; also a tabulated statement of the areas withdrawn for various purposes in each public-land State and the total areas withdrawn in each State and in all of the public-land States.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

After the word "State," where it first appears in line 11, insert the words "and Territory;" in line 11 strike out the words "in each State and;" and at the end of the bill add the words "and Territories," and as amended that it do pass.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask that the amendments be agreed to.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574, being the bill providing for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider the bill H. R. 21574.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I ask unanimous consent that an amendment or amendments be considered and be in order to the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government (H. R. 21574) in the Committee of the Whole, increasing the compensation of the Speaker,

Members, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the Vice-President and Senators, and members of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the request.

The Clerk read as follows:

I ask unanimous consent that an amendment or amendments may be considered and be in order to the bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government (H. R. 21574) in the Committee of the Whole, increasing the compensation of the Speaker, Members, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the Vice-President, Senators, and members of the Cabinet.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GILBERT. Would it be in order to add to that resolution "and clerks in the Departments?" If that is in order, I move that as an amendment.

Mr. LITTAUER. I could not now accept such an amendment. It is an entirely different field of service and has very broad bearings, differing widely from those concerned in this request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LITTAUER. I trust the gentleman from Alabama will withhold his objection to this request for unanimous consent in order that it may be considered in Committee of the Whole, so that we may get an expression of the Committee of the Whole on the subject. The request for unanimous consent will preclude a point of order being made in the committee against the consideration of a subject which has received general approval outside of Congress as well as in it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That is my very proposition. If this was a proposition that it should be considered in the House, it would be another matter. If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent to consider the proposition in the House and the House wishes to consider it, while I am against the proposition, I would not object to that.

Mr. LITTAUER. This is an appropriation and would necessarily have to go to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I do not look upon it as a proposition to appropriate money; I look upon it as a change of existing law, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. LITTAUER. Which, in effect, requires an appropriation of money.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman agree to an amendment giving consideration in the House, and if the amendment should be adopted to the bill, that that amendment would be considered separately in the House?

Mr. LITTAUER. I not only agree to that, but—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman from New York that it is quite competent for the House by unanimous consent, if it desires so to do, after this bill is reported from the Committee of the Whole House, to agree at this time that the matter about which the gentleman asks unanimous consent shall be considered in the House as an amendment to the bill, if it be reported from the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from New York that so far as I am concerned, if he desires to make his request that this matter may be considered, while I am opposed to the matter and intend to vote against it, I am perfectly willing that the House should consider it in the House; and if he will make his request that this matter shall be considered in the House after the House comes out of the Committee of the Whole on this bill, and will state that he will allow a reasonable time for debate on the question, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman modifies his objection.

Mr. LITTAUER. I modify my request to include the condition stated by the gentleman from Alabama.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was then taken on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. HEPBURN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to the following in the office of the President of the United States: Secretary, \$5,000; two assistant secretaries, at \$3,000 each; executive clerk, \$2,500; executive clerk and disbursing officer, \$2,000; seven clerks, at \$2,000 each; one clerk of class 4, who shall be a telegrapher; four clerks of class 3; two clerks of class 2; steward, \$1,800; chief doorkeeper, \$1,800; eight doorkeepers, at \$1,200 each; four messengers, at \$1,200 each; five messengers, at \$900 each; watchman, \$900; one fireman; laborer, \$720; laborer, \$600; in all, \$67,740. *Provided*, That employees of the Executive Departments and other establishments of the executive branch of the Government may

be detailed from time to time to the office of the President of the United States for such temporary assistance as may be necessary.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph, and wish to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether there is any record as to the number of employees who are temporarily transferred from the different Departments to the office of the President?

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman will refer to the bill, from line 14 to and including line 18, page 35, that is in existing law.

Mr. MANN. I understand it is in existing law, but that does not authorize it here. I have no objection to the item, but I would like—

Mr. BINGHAM. The view the committee took was that the existing law seemed to be acceptable, and no proposition to change having been submitted, your committee as a rule continues current law.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand that to be the rule.

Mr. LITTAUER. There was no information brought to our committee, at least, as to how much advantage was taken of the privilege.

Mr. MANN. Are any of these people permanently employed up there, do you know?

Mr. LITTAUER. None; of that I am quite confident.

Mr. BINGHAM. There was no statement submitted whatever.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural carrier examining board: For one chief of division, \$2,000; one clerk of class 3; two clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; three clerks, at \$1,000 each; ten clerks, at \$900 each, and one assistant messenger; in all, \$22,720: *Provided*, That no detail of clerks or other employees from the Executive Departments or other Government establishments in Washington, D. C., to the Civil Service Commission, for the performance of duty in the District of Columbia, shall be made for or during the fiscal year 1908. The Civil Service Commission shall, however, have power to transfer or detail any of its employees herein provided for to or from its office force, field force, or rural carrier examining board.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on lines 14 to 17, page 37.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state to the gentleman that is current law.

Mr. MANN. If it is law it does not need to go in here, and if it is not law it is not entitled to go in here.

Mr. LITTAUER. It is current law, and I will give you an explanation of it. The Civil Service Commission has, year after year, asked us to amalgamate three forces together—the office force, the field force, and the rural carrier examining board. We have, however, declared we will not accept these lumpings of clerical assistance, but we want to know what each one has to do. Consequently we divided the force into three branches, and yet there are times when the clerks from one branch—for instance, the rural carrier examining board—must help out the field force or the office force, and in order to give them the privilege of utilizing services not required in one branch in another branch we have added that provision, which obtains in every Department.

Mr. MANN. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I do not think it is a provision that obtains in every Department, and I see no special reason why the Civil Service Commission should be the first to violate the law.

Mr. LITTAUER. I think you are wrong. I think every Department has a right to transfer clerks from one bureau of the Department to another bureau, and it has the express statutory privilege. Here is a small bureau, or department you can call it, with three branches. We specify the force for each one of the three and then say if you have at any time an emergency in any one of those three branches take your additional assistants required from one of the other branches.

Mr. MANN. If you say "in case of an emergency" they can do this, I have no objection; but the fact is, you divide the force into three branches and then provided that they could use the men in any branch for the work in another branch and not pay any attention whatever to the division.

Mr. LITTAUER. But they do pay attention to the division, and come here every year asking us to wipe out the three divisions. They did it this year.

Mr. MANN. I understand that; but I understand also that in effect they do wipe out these divisions which you insist upon preserving and thus permit them to escape from. They do make an escape. If you say in case of an emergency they can make the transfer, very well.

Mr. LITTAUER. There would be no harm at all in saying that. If the gentleman desires to offer an amendment, I surely will not object to it.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman offer it?

Mr. BINGHAM. They will determine what is the emergency.

Mr. MANN. They pay no attention to it practically at all, I am told—

Mr. LITTAUER. Would the gentleman suppose the use of the word "emergency" would make any difference?

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; it would make a difference.

Mr. LITTAUER. I have no objection, if it will result in better administration. That is the purpose of your committee in submitting this.

Mr. MANN. How would it do to insert "have power in case of emergency to transfer or detail?"

Mr. BINGHAM. There is no objection.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order, Mr. Chairman, and offer an amendment, to insert, after the word "power," in line 14, the words "in case of emergency."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 37, line 14, after the word "power," insert "in case of emergency."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury shall each year prepare and submit in his annual report to Congress estimates of the public revenue and the public expenditures for the fiscal year current, and also for the fiscal year next ensuing at the time said report is submitted, together with a statement of the receipts and expenditures of the Government for the preceding completed fiscal year.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon that paragraph.

Mr. BINGHAM. What does the gentleman wish?

Mr. MANN. I would like to know why it should go in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Is this new?

Mr. BINGHAM. The chairman of the committee has had some correspondence in connection with this suggested amendment to the current law, and he will explain the character of the information that he desires.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I will state for the information of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and for the information of the committee, the reason for this provision. Until last year it was the custom of the Secretary of the Treasury, in his annual report, to include not only statements of expenditures, but also an estimate of the amount of revenue the Secretary of the Treasury has reason to believe the Government will receive during the next fiscal year. It is upon this estimate that the amount of the budgets or appropriation bills are largely based. For the fiscal year 1906 the Secretary of the Treasury omitted this estimate from his annual report. In submitting to the House, at the close of the last session, a statement of the aggregate appropriations the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations was unable to obtain from the Treasury Department an estimate of the revenues for the fiscal year 1907 for which Congress made the appropriations.

I personally addressed a letter to the Secretary for the purpose of obtaining an estimate. I did not care to bring it into the House or have the statement go to the country that we had appropriated about \$880,000,000 for the fiscal year 1907 without being able to show that the Government was reasonably certain of having sufficient revenue during the year to meet these appropriations. Thereupon I wrote a letter to the Secretary and asked him to give me an estimate of the probable revenue for that year, calling his attention to the fact that his annual report did not, as usual, contain this estimate. The Secretary declined, saying that it would be only a guess, and that he did not care to make a guess on the subject. There is no department of the Government so well equipped to estimate with reasonable certainty the revenues for the coming fiscal year as the Treasury Department. It has therefore been the custom for Congress to rely upon these estimates in preparing the appropriations. In view of the necessity for this information and the fact that it was refused, your committee felt justified in proposing this provision for that purpose. Without this estimate Congress has nothing to guide it in determining whether the aggregate of appropriations will exceed the revenues or not.

Mr. MANN. Has this matter been brought to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. TAWNEY. This provision?

Mr. MANN. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not. It was brought to his attention by me as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations before the close of last session, when in a letter I requested the Secretary to give the committee an estimate of the revenue and he declined.

Mr. MANN. And in response he stated it was impossible.

Thereupon you propose by law to compel him to do that which he says is impossible.

Mr. TAWNEY. It has not been impossible in the past. It has been the uniform custom for a great many years for the Secretary of the Treasury to submit an estimate of revenue for the coming fiscal year, and the present Secretary himself submitted an estimate in the annual report preceding his annual report for the fiscal year 1906.

Mr. MANN. He says now that those estimates are valueless.

Mr. TAWNEY. They have served as a guide, and it is very important to the general public and to Congress to know whether or not—

Mr. MANN. I would not dispute the word of the eminent chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, although I have never noticed that Congress paid much attention to that estimate in making appropriations.

Mr. TAWNEY. The gentleman from Illinois can not cite us to an instance when Congress deliberately appropriated beyond the estimated revenue. The gentleman must also know that in the preparation of appropriation bills Congress must necessarily have information as to the probable revenues of the Government for the fiscal year for which it makes appropriations.

Now, to what Department of the Government can Congress look for that information if not to the Treasury Department? That Department controls all the machinery for the collection of revenue. It is in touch with the revenues of the Government and is charged with the execution of the revenue laws. Certainly if it is not possible for the Treasury Department to give it, it would be impossible for any other Department to furnish it. The estimate submitted at the last session is an estimate that the chairman himself made, showing a surplus of \$40,000,000, and is the only official estimate of revenue for this fiscal year Congress or the country has had. There is no foreign government that does not submit to the legislative department its estimate of the revenues, and upon these estimates the appropriations are based.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Why does the Secretary of the Treasury decline to give this information?

Mr. TAWNEY. Well, the only answer we received was that it would be a mere guess. That is the language, as I now recall.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman disagree with the Secretary of the Treasury upon the matter?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will this impose additional labor on the Government?

Mr. TAWNEY. Not at all.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Will it cost the Government anything at all?

Mr. TAWNEY. Nothing at all.

Mr. MANN. That is what I want to know about.

Mr. TAWNEY. The Secretary is guessing upon the revenues of the current year from day to day. We are now told by the Treasury Department that the surplus during this fiscal year will amount to in the neighborhood of \$55,000,000 or \$60,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more. There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. What the gentleman says is so patent, apparently, that it seems to me that before enacting legislation along these lines to compel a public servant to do this thing which he has been doing in the past, but which he now refuses to do, that we ought to know from him why he has refused.

Mr. TAWNEY. I did say why he has refused.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman tell us why?

Mr. TAWNEY. I said he refused because he considered his estimate a mere guess.

Mr. MANN. He refused to give the gentleman the information in response to a private letter?

Mr. TAWNEY. No; it was not a private letter, it was an official letter.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman stated he addressed it.

Mr. TAWNEY. I addressed him as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MANN. He was not required by law or custom to do so.

Mr. TAWNEY. He was required by custom to submit estimates of the revenues, and I maintain that a fair construction of his duties as defined by law requires him to do so. As to why it was not done this year I do not know. I do not say this or propose this provision in any spirit of criticism or as any reflection upon the Secretary.

Mr. MANN. I do not care whether you are making a reflection or not.

Mr. TAWNEY. I have no doubt that the Secretary will comply, and all Secretaries will comply with this provision hereafter to the best of their ability, and that is all we expect. I do not think Congress ought to be put in the position of being left to depend upon the whim of any future Secretary of the Treasury as to whether he shall give information as to what the revenues of the Government will be for the next fiscal year. Certain it is he can give a reasonably accurate estimate with the information the Treasury Department has at its hand and its facilities for obtaining information.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman assumes here is a matter of interesting information that must be obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury, information that the Secretary has heretofore afforded, and that the Secretary has now refused to give that information, and thereupon the gentleman stops.

Mr. TAWNEY. No, I do not.

Mr. MANN. We ought to know from the Secretary of the Treasury why he has declined to give this information.

Mr. TAWNEY. There is nothing further to do in respect to obtaining that information but to put a provision in here requiring the Treasury Department, as a matter of law, to submit it.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman ought to ask the Secretary of the Treasury why he declined to give the information.

Mr. BRICK. He did.

Mr. TAWNEY. I can submit the letter to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. I take the gentleman's word for it.

Mr. BRICK. The gentleman stated that the Secretary did not give the information because it would be a mere guess.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Who disputes his explanation?

Mr. MANN. If that be the truth, that this is a mere guess, then it ought not to be enacted into law.

Mr. BONYNGE. The chairman does not agree with him that this is a mere guess.

Mr. TAWNEY. It is not necessarily a mere guess. It has not been so in the past, and I do not think it will be so in the future.

Mr. MANN. Does the chairman think this is necessary?

Mr. TAWNEY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MANN. The Clerk will not read until we dispose of the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand the gentleman had made any point of order.

Mr. MANN. I reserved it, but I now withdraw the point.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at Chicago: For assistant treasurer, \$5,000; cashier, \$3,000; vault clerk, \$1,800; paying teller, \$1,800; assorting teller, \$1,800; silver and redemption teller, and change teller, at \$1,800 each; receiving teller, \$1,700; clerk, \$1,600; bookkeeper, \$1,800; two bookkeepers, at \$1,500 each; assistant paying teller, \$1,500; four coin, coupon, and currency clerks, at \$1,500 each; twenty-six clerks, at \$1,200 each; one detective and hall man, \$1,100; messenger, \$840; stenographer, \$900; janitor, \$600; and three watchmen, at \$720 each; in all, \$69,400.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last word. I have called the attention of the committee upon several occasions to the discrepancy in the salaries paid in the offices of the assistant treasurers. Chicago, which does the largest business in volume outside of New York City—and possibly in the number of transactions almost as large a business as New York City, because Chicago has an immense field from the Post-Office Department, which makes daily remittances, much larger than New York City—Chicago is discriminated against even in this bill.

In Boston there are four employees in the subtreasury receiving salaries of \$2,000 and upward. In Philadelphia there are three, in St. Louis there are two, in New Orleans there are three, in San Francisco there are six; while in Chicago there is but one.

In addition to that fact, the responsibility which some of these tellers assume is very great. During the last year or two in Chicago, when a new assistant treasurer was appointed, one or two of the tellers, who had taken in money theretofore passed and accepted by the Government in the form in which it was, under the rules and regulations of the Treasury Department, had coin thrown back upon them to the extent of several hundred dollars each. These gentlemen receive the munificent salary of seventeen or eighteen hundred dollars a year. Now, I wish to ask the gentleman if he is not willing to make some increases in this office? If there ever was a time when we could make an increase, it is now. If there ever was a time when it was needed, it is now. With the exception of the one increase that is proposed in the bill and two increases which were made two or three years ago, there has been no increase in the salaries of these employees for many, many years.

Mr. BINGHAM. I submit to the gentleman that there has been no intentional discrimination against Chicago.

Mr. MANN. No; I understand that.

Mr. BINGHAM. So far as the Chicago office is concerned, I have no doubt the gentleman approves of the increase of \$500 which we have given. There is no doubt that Chicago is the second subtreasury—next to New York; but during the past ten years there has been a large increase in the force of the Chicago office; perhaps larger than in any other subtreasury in the country.

Mr. MANN. An increase in the force and in the business, but not in the compensation of individuals.

Mr. BINGHAM. An occasional increase in compensation and a large increase in the force, and there has never been, if I remember, what might be called a serious complaint. All the subtreasurers asked increases, and there was no special insistence with regard to this subtreasury; and your committee felt that as the force was ample for the work and that they have been receiving a reasonable compensation, with the one exception which we increased and which we called an exception, it was fair to continue the office under its present ratings and allowances.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will pardon me, he says there has been no insistence before the committee. The subtreasurer in Chicago is forbidden, and the officials of the subtreasury there are forbidden, to appear before your committee, and they are forbidden to appeal to Members of Congress.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true.

Mr. MANN. They are forbidden to do anything, and there is nothing that can be done except a recommendation through the Department. I take it that that recommendation was made to your committee.

Mr. BINGHAM. In a general way, yes, just as the Department makes many recommendations, but your committee reached the conclusion, after hearing Mr. Keep, who went into the matter with considerable detail, as the gentleman knows if he has read the hearings—

Mr. MANN. I have never seen the hearings on that subject, so I do not know. But I know this, if I may say so to the gentleman—I know there has been a most insistent demand on the part of the retiring assistant treasurer and upon the part of the one who has recently been appointed that these salaries be increased, this recommendation having been made after investigation, and I know they have not been able to obtain and retain good employees in some of these places. There have been a number of changes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have made all the explanation that it is possible to make. I think it is a fair explanation. The work is being done well. There may be some reasonable criticism as to the compensations, but your committee reached the conclusion that the conditions at the independent treasuries might remain as they were, with the little change made in Chicago, without any injury to the public service.

Mr. MANN. I assure the gentleman that it is injuring the public service in Chicago. They have a row on now, growing out of having these very clerks held responsible for the acceptance of this coin. There has been a row between the Treasury Department and the retiring subtreasurer in reference to that.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is in litigation.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no, it is not, and we will never submit to its going that far; but the Government is requiring a very unjust thing on the part of the subtreasurer, for the reason that these employees were not able out of their salaries to replace the coin which they had on hand, but which the Government would not accept as current funds.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman sees that that would open up a question of which we could not take cognizance, unless the gentleman sees proper to offer independent legislation as to the responsibility whenever in the operation of any financial institution such a question as this should arise.

Mr. MANN. If we hold a clerk responsible for such things, after the coin has once been accepted by the Government, I want to see the clerk paid salary enough so that we may properly hold him responsible. But why should the teller in Chicago receive a salary of \$1,800, and tellers in Boston, Philadelphia, St. Louis, and San Francisco, doing not one-tenth of the business, receive salaries of \$2,000, \$2,200, or \$2,500?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, yes; they do more than the gentleman says, because Philadelphia comes next to Chicago in the amount of business.

Mr. MANN. I do not mean to say that all of these places do not do one-tenth of the business.

Mr. BINGHAM. The committee have endeavored to do substantial justice.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I suppose there is no arguing with the gentleman, but I move to amend by striking out, in line 11, page 65, the words "one thousand eight hundred" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "two thousand."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 65, line 11, strike out "one thousand eight hundred" and insert "two thousand."

Mr. BINGHAM. I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the point of order?

Mr. BINGHAM. I make the point of order that it changes existing law. The authorization of the law is \$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman the statute before him—the present law?

Mr. BINGHAM. The present appropriation law governs the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Illinois state whether the statute fixes the salary at \$2,000? Will the gentleman from Illinois cite the statute, if such a statute exists?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there is no statute fixing the salary of any of these officers, except the current appropriation act.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the Chair would ask the gentleman what was the amount carried in the last appropriation bill?

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt the gentleman is correct. As I understand, the gentleman from Pennsylvania states that it was the same amount that is in this bill—\$1,800.

The CHAIRMAN. Then the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the Chair finally rules, may I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that under the ruling of the Chair last year the whole item is probably subject to a point of order, because, as I understand, the ruling of the Chair last year was that where there was no authority of law for an office the item was subject to a point of order. If the item in the original instance in this case was subject to a point of order, changing the amount is not subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that this item was appropriated for in the identical language of the last appropriation bill. If that is so, then the point of order is sustained.

Mr. MANN. The ruling last year by the gentleman in the chair at that time was, that although the current appropriation act appropriated for certain clerks at a certain salary, that did not warrant the same item being included in the bill then pending unless it was authorized by statute. That was the ruling last year, resulting in the throwing out of a great number of these officers, clerks, and salaries, to such an extent that the committee were compelled to appeal to the Committee on Rules, which brought in a special rule giving the right to the consideration of these items in the bill. If that ruling was right last year, this item in the original instance was subject to a point of order. I know there has been a lot of holding, and I think the Chair can find authority to hold any way the Chair desires on this matter.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of that suggestion, the Chair will adhere to his ruling. [Laughter.]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SHERMAN having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6855. An act to amend the act approved August 19, 1890, entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea."

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of War, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$3,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; clerk to the Secretary, \$2,000; stenographer to the Secretary, \$1,800; clerk to the Assistant Secretary, \$2,100; clerk to the chief clerk, \$2,100; disbursing clerk, \$2,500; appointment clerk, \$2,000; four chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; superintendent of buildings outside of State, War, and Navy Department building, in addition to compensation as chief of division, \$250; chief telegrapher, \$1,800; four clerks of class 4; four clerks of class 3; fourteen clerks of class 2; eighteen clerks of class 1; five clerks, at \$1,000 each; one clerk, \$900; one clerk, at \$720; one foreman, \$1,200; carpenter, \$1,000; chief messenger, \$1,000; two carpenters, at \$900 each; six messengers; seven assistant messengers; one telephone switchboard operator; one assistant telephone switchboard operator; two messenger boys, at \$360 each; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; one fireman; four watchmen; five watchmen, at \$660 each;

eight laborers; two laborers, at \$470 each; hostler, \$600; two hostlers and one watchman, at \$540 each; one telephone operator, \$480; two elevator conductors, one at \$600 and one at \$470; four charwomen; in all, \$138,620.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 81, line 3, strike out the words "six hundred and twenty" and insert in lieu thereof "five hundred and sixty."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, \$8,000; First Assistant Secretary, \$4,500, and for additional compensation while the office is held by the present incumbent, \$1,500; Assistant Secretary, \$4,500; chief clerk, \$2,500, and \$500 additional as superintendent of the Patent Office building and other buildings of the Department of the Interior; additional to one member of Board of Pension Appeals, acting as chief of the board, \$500; twelve members of a Board of Pension Appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at \$2,000 each, including three members to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior from the sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals appropriated for and employed during the fiscal year 1907; three additional members of said Board of Pension Appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be selected from the force of the Pension Office, at \$2,000 each; special land inspector, connected with the administration of the public-land service, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be subject to his direction, \$2,500; five special inspectors, Department of the Interior, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be subject to his direction, at \$2,500 each; clerk in charge of documents, \$2,100; custodian, who shall give bond in such sum as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,100; seven clerks, chiefs of division, at \$2,250 each, one of whom shall be disbursing clerk; four clerks, at \$2,000 each; private secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, \$2,500; sixteen clerks of class 4; sixteen clerks of class 3; twenty-five clerks of class 2; thirty-six clerks of class 1, two of whom shall be stenographers or typewriters; returns office clerk, \$1,200; female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, \$1,200; six clerks, at \$1,000 each; one clerk, \$900; twelve copyists; two copyists or typewriters, at \$900 each; switchboard telephone operator; nine messengers; seven assistant messengers; eighteen laborers; two skilled mechanics, one at \$900 and one at \$720; two carpenters, at \$900 each; plumber, \$900; electrician, \$1,000; one laborer, \$600; six laborers, at \$480 each; one packer, \$660; two conductors of elevator, at \$720 each; four charwomen; captain of the watch, \$1,200; forty watchmen; additional to two watchmen acting as lieutenants of watchmen, at \$120 each; engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$1,000; seven firemen; one clerk, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, to sign, under the direction of the Secretary, in his name and for him, his approval of all tribal deeds to allottees and deeds for town lots made and executed according to law for any of the Five Civilized Tribes of Indians in the Indian Territory, \$1,200; in all, \$327,690.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out after the word "each," in line 9, page 106 of the bill, the following:

"Including three members to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior from the sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals, appropriated for and employed during the fiscal year 1907; three additional members of said Board of Pension Appeals to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be selected from the force of the Pension Office, at \$2,000 each," and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals, to be selected and appointed by the Secretary of the Interior from persons not now employed in the Pension Office, and without compliance with the conditions prescribed by the act entitled 'An act to regulate and improve the civil service,' approved January 16, 1883, for the fiscal year 1908, at \$2,000 each; and vacancies occurring in this force of sixteen additional members of the Board of Pension Appeals during the fiscal year 1908 shall not be filled."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that the proposed amendment is a change of existing law.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have submitted is identical, with the exception of one word, with the current appropriation bill. It is a continuance of the board as created three or four years ago and as carried year after year in the appropriation bill. The only change is of a single word, which is this: In the present appropriation bill it provides that vacancies occurring during the fiscal year of 1907 shall not be refilled. This amendment provides that vacancies occurring in the year 1908 shall not be filled. The provisions are identical, except the word "eight" instead of the word "seven."

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; and that is the radical change in the law.

Mr. DALZELL. No; it is the purpose to continue the law.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, you continue the board which the law says shall expire.

Mr. SHERMAN. No; the law says vacancies occurring during the year shall not be filled, and I say that vacancies occurring during the coming year shall not be filled. We do not ask any other change.

Mr. LITTAUER. The law also adds that at the end of 1907 said employment shall cease.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, you continue the current law another year. The current law distinctly sets forth that

it shall conclude at the end of 1907. Gentlemen understand how reluctantly I do this, because I am a soldier myself.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, the situation is that the law originally provided for the appointment of what is called the "permanent board of appeals," consisting of twelve members. Later on there was legislation increasing that membership by authorizing twenty temporaries, and that provision was carried on from year to year, and last year the current appropriation bill provided for sixteen members only of the temporary members of the board, and provided that at the end of the fiscal year their employment should cease. Now, the committee has reported an appropriation for three of that sixteen, and that is a part of the bill, and no point of order was made against it, so that it is in the bill, but it is new legislation. The committee now reports an appropriation for three members of a temporary board of appeals for which there is no law. The effect of the proposed amendment is to increase the number from three to sixteen. I assume that where the committee brings in legislation that is subject to a point of order, if no point be made the provision is amendable.

Mr. BINGHAM. That original provision was subject to a point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; and it is amendable.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. If an amendment is in order to increase the number to four, it certainly is in order to increase it to sixteen. That is the situation of this question as it is now presented.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Yes.

Mr. LITTAUER. If it be in order to increase the number from three to sixteen, is it in order to increase it to sixteen with the various additions added to the amendment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Those provisions are pure limitations. We may increase the force with limitations, providing how the additional members shall be paid and how they shall be appointed. I think those provisions are proper limitations. Now, I insist, since the committee has made provision for three for which there is no authority in law, it opens the door for any sort of a germane amendment. It is a new subject, and we may increase the number from three to sixteen and may fix terms and limitations that are germane. It is a new subject of legislation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the point of order further than to emphasize what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] has said, that it has always been held that where a provision is brought in which is subject to a point of order and no point of order is raised against it, an amendment perfecting that provision is in order.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to occupy the time of the committee, except to emphasize what the gentleman from Indiana has said.

The CHAIRMAN. It is the other side that the Chair desires to hear from.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] did not, as I understand it, attempt to amend that part of the paragraph where provision is made for the additional three members to the permanent force, but did seek to reinstate the language of the present current law, wherein a provision was added that "at the end of which year such employment shall cease." I can not appreciate the point made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] that in the method in which this amendment is presented it does not contravene the rule against new legislation. It appears to me to be an entirely different set of pension-appeal examiners, one temporary and the other permanent.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the Chair to this fact, that if the committee can add three it can add six or nine or sixteen. If three are in order, the whole sixteen are in order.

Mr. BINGHAM. All of which would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Would have been, yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; would have been.

The CHAIRMAN. If a point of order had been made against the text of the bill the Chair would have sustained that point of order, but no such point of order was made. That being so, it is clear to the Chair that any amendment that is germane to that matter is competent for the committee to consider. The point of order is therefore overruled. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, before that question is taken it seems to me that the Committee of the Whole should at least be placed in possession of the facts in connection with this tem-

porary board of pension appeals. The committee will remember that a board of nine members was originally established and was then increased to twelve and then, I believe some three years ago, an additional force of twenty temporary appointees was placed there at a time when the number of appeals accumulated in the office of the Secretary of the Interior numbered about 20,000. The work had gone on, I believe, for two or three years when last year we were confronted with the fact that the number of these appeals had been reduced from 20,000 to about 3,000. We then amended the law, or the provision for the law, so that vacancies that then existed could not be filled, and that no further vacancies could be filled during the current year. Moreover, we added the provision that the force itself should be entirely discontinued at the end of the current year—that is, the temporary force. The original nine, with the added three, are there under a permanent order. This is one of the temporary forces added to clean up work in a great Department, to do justice to the old soldier in order that his claims of every kind and character might have final and proper consideration before a great board of pension appeals. Unfortunately the only way to get such a board is to give temporary employment. The employment was given, of course, without civil service examination, and the result is that, as far as my experience has gone, whenever you get such a force in you can never get it out, and the only way to do is to amalgamate it with the regular force.

Now, the facts in the case are that we have had about twenty-eight of these pension-appeal examiners, and they passed upon one case of appeal a day, just one appeal during the seven or seven and a half hours' work which we have here, and bear in mind that these appeals come to them after having passed through, I believe, three or four prior examinations in the Pension Office. The appeals come all briefed, and they include some appeals in reference to pension attorneys' fees, perhaps not a great number, but quite a good number of them.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do.

Mr. KEIFER. I understood the gentleman to say these members of the pension-appeal board dispose of but one appeal a day.

Mr. LITTAUER. Just one.

Mr. KEIFER. Just one. The record shows that twenty-eight members have disposed of an average of 824 per month.

Mr. LITTAUER. No; 867.

Mr. KEIFER. Well, I am speaking of an average for a particular five months. How do you make that out?

Mr. LITTAUER. During the last seven months, commencing February, 1906, during that period 6,059 cases have been disposed of, averaging 867 each month. Divide the twenty-eight into the 867 and you get—well, one is not exactly right, because there are only twenty-six working days, but in twenty-six working days thirty-one of these appeal cases are disposed of by each examiner.

Mr. OVERSTREET. How many appeals are now pending? How nearly up is this board?

Mr. SHERMAN. Seventeen hundred and twelve.

Mr. LITTAUER. I will get to that. A year ago we were advised that there were 3,000 cases yet undetermined and that at that time the force was catching up at quite a rapid rate, so we attempted last year to eliminate this board, but in order to give ample force to continue the work all places which were filled at that time were continued to the number—

Mr. TAWNEY. Will my colleague permit an interruption?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not a fact the limitation upon the life of the board carried in the current law was placed there upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. LITTAUER. On the express recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, reenforced by the recommendation of the at that time Commissioner of Pensions. All of them advised us that board could well cease and end at the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. KEIFER. I would like to interrupt the gentleman again.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. LITTAUER. I do.

Mr. KEIFER. I understand that both the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman on the floor say that this reduction was made at the instance of the Secretary of the Interior last year. I beg leave to say that the Secretary of the Interior qualified all that original recommendation both before the Committee on Appropriations and in the

House and Senate, and stated if there was an increase in the appeals it would not be sufficient.

Mr. LITTAUER. When was that qualification made?

Mr. KEIFER. Made in the Record. The chairman read it the other day.

Mr. LITTAUER. Now, the Record shows that during the years this pension board has been at work, the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, 13,719 cases were disposed of. The next year, with the same force, 10,496 cases received final attention. The next year it jumped up again to 13,715, and the last year, ending June 30 last, when this board had the full number of thirty-two members, there were 10,173 cases disposed of, a reduction of 3,542 from the previous year.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. LITTAUER. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. What number of cases are now pending for consideration by the board of appeals?

Mr. LITTAUER. We are advised here, October 1, 1906, 1,712 cases. That is about two months' work, and your committee, considering all the circumstances of this—

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does that make provision for cases subsequently appealed to the board?

Mr. LITTAUER. I have given you simply a statement of the number of cases before the board on that day—that is, October the 1st. The cases appealed during the month of September were of course in that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Has the gentleman from New York any information as to the number of cases that were pending before the commission a year ago?

Mr. LITTAUER. A year ago there were 3,000—just about 3,050, if my memory serves me right.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. At that ratio it would take a full year, at least, to catch up with the work?

Mr. LITTAUER. It depends altogether, of course, on the number of new cases that come along. It used to take two or three years to have one of these appeals attended to. It now takes less than two or three months. I maintain that if the appeals were doubled up from what they are to-day the old soldier's interest would be promptly attended to. I believe the last advice I had was that 7 per cent of these appeals are reversed.

Mr. KEIFER. Nine.

Mr. LITTAUER. My last information, from a very reliable source, was that it was 7, although I must admit that the Secretary of the Interior in here says that he thinks it was 15; latterly we got information that it was 9. But whether it be 9 or 7, those are the only individuals who can in any way suffer any harm from this appeal of two or three months.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. But if the gentleman will permit me, when a man makes an appeal it is important to him that he have a decision on it one way or the other.

Mr. LITTAUER. That is unquestionably so, and the decision he no doubt would like to have that very minute, but most of the appeals take more than two months to be disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this question resolves itself into whether or not this temporary force shall be continued a sufficient length of time to bring the work up current. The board is now over 1,400 cases behind. On the statement of Assistant Secretary Wilson the appeals run from 800 to 900 a month. This board with the present force will take care of just about that number. It has been reduced by resignations and otherwise by four members. When it had the full number it took care of about 1,000 cases a month. Now it takes care of between 800 and 900. The appeals have constantly increased since appellants find they can get a comparatively early decision from the court. There is no reason to think that that condition of things will not obtain in the future; that the number of appeals will at least remain where it is now. That being the case, it is necessary to have the full number if you would give a prompt decision to these men, to many of whom delay means death before the decision is made. I say to you, gentlemen, that we can well afford to give the veterans the benefit of any doubt for twelve months more. That is the limitation put upon the membership of the court by the pending amendment.

Put these trained men at work twelve months more and give them an opportunity, at least, to bring the appeals down current with the applications made. What harm can come of it? Suppose you do not do it? Then, on the statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, your appeals will continue to increase month by month until sooner or later you will have to go over

this same course of procedure and employ not a trained body of experts, but a new body of men, to take up the work where these men leave off. The time has come when we can not afford to dally with interests vital to many of these men for the pitance involved in this amendment. Let us pass it, and let these men who now take their appeal be responded to promptly, as they responded promptly when the nation appealed to them to save its life. [Applause.]

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow a question before he takes his seat?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER] yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER]?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I have statistics, obtained from some source, and I want to know if they were submitted to the committee. They show that last year, 1905, for five months from July 1, there were 2,658 appeals, at the rate of 531 per month. The same month this year, beginning July 1 last, there were 4,120 appeals taken, at the rate of 824 a month.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. That is substantially in the hearings.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. That was in the hearings?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Substantially.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. And on the basis of the statistics last year this recommendation contained in the current bill was incorporated, providing that the tenure ceased on the 1st of July; and the increased number of appeals, I understand, is one of the chief reasons why the gentleman insists upon keeping the whole board in operation.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. If the gentleman will allow me to read. Mr. Wilson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, says: But the appeals are coming in between 800 and 900 a month now.

The gentleman will find that on page 227.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Does he recommend the retention of the entire board this year?

Mr. KEIFER. He says they could only dispose of a thousand cases when they had four more members than they have now. He says repeatedly, in substance, that they can not dispose of the appeals if you reduce the board, because of the accumulation of appeals, and he urges the retention of the full board.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, my honored colleague makes the suggestion that the only people who would be harmed by the provisions of the bill in doing away with this special board are the appellants. I know so well, Mr. Chairman, that my honored colleague is desirous of serving in every legitimate way the old soldiers that I do not believe he wants that statement to remain unqualified, especially when we remember that there is no body of men in this country that Congress is more desirous of serving than this same body; there is nobody that they are more desirous to save from any harm whatever.

Now, my colleague suggests that last year the Secretary said that this board could be done away with. He substantially said that upon the recommendation of the Secretary a year ago they inserted the provision that the board should cease to exist at the end of this fiscal year. In other words, the position of the committee then was to take its stand upon the recommendation of the Secretary; whereas this year, when the Secretary, the Assistant Secretary, and the Commissioner all unite in recommending that this board be continued, they propose not to follow that recommendation. It is very easy, when the recommendations of the Secretary are in accordance with our ideas to appeal to the recommendation to sustain our position, but when it is adverse, why we override it.

My colleague says, and says erroneously, that there is but one appeal decided a day. It is not quite correct, but the average is less than two. But, Mr. Chairman, do we wish to have these appeals hurriedly passed upon, without doing justice to the appellant and to the Government. The report and the hearings before the committee, and the statement of the Secretary, show that varied and numerous legal questions, as well as questions of fact, arise in these cases—questions relating to the marriage laws of the various States, etc. Certainly it is not the desire of Congress, in the work of passing upon these appeals, to be so hurried as to do injustice either to the appellant or the Government of the United States.

Now, before this board was created there were 16,000 cases unheard, and it took more than two years for an appeal to be heard, and I am making that statement from the hearings before the Committee on Appropriations. Two years ago there were 3,000 cases pending at the end of the year, and the board was continued for another year. On the 1st of October last there were 1,700 cases pending, and taking an average from this report from the hearing before the committee there will come in, as has been stated, an increase from month to month,

but taking the average last given here there will be 9,606 new cases to be disposed of, and there were 1,712 pending on the 1st day of October; so that there will be 11,318 cases to dispose of during the next fiscal year, and the present board disposed of 10,173. So that if the average of new appeals is not increased, there will still be at the end of the next fiscal year cases pending that the board will not have been able to consider even if it is maintained at its present number.

Mr. Chairman, where the interests of the old soldier and the interests of the Government are so vital as they are in this case it does seem to me that in justice to the Government and in justice to them that we ought to continue this board, in accordance with the recommendation of all the people who know about it and make report and appear before the committee and make statements of fact. We ought to continue this board for at least one more year. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, if I know myself, I have not the slightest disposition to do an injustice to the old soldier; but how any intelligent man can vote for this amendment, after the clear and comprehensive statement made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER], I can not understand. From the remarks that have been made in support of this amendment one might conclude that there was a disposition here on the part of somebody not to serve the old soldier, but, on the contrary, to do an act of injustice to the old soldier. Is this true? As a matter of fact, and every man here knows it, on the statute books are found the most liberal, yes, the most generous, pension laws that have ever been enacted by any country during the history of the civilized world. We have a horde of clerks in the Pension Bureau—all of whom are favorable to the old soldier—to construe these pension laws when he files his application under them. After these generous laws have been construed by clerks who are, as I have said, biased in favor of the old soldier, if perchance their action is adverse to the claim of the old soldier he has the right to appeal to a Board of Review, and on that Board there is not one single individual hostile to the old soldier. If, again, this Board's decision is again adverse to the old soldier, he has the further right to appeal to the Board of Rereview, as it is termed; and if here the decision is adverse he can carry his case to the Commissioner of Pensions, and from the Commissioner of Pensions he can finally appeal to the Secretary of the Interior. At each of these points you afford him, if he can show an act of injustice has been done, the opportunity to have it righted. And, yet, Mr. Chairman, we are importuned to be cautious for fear that an injustice will be done the old soldier.

There is no necessity for this Board of Appeals now, and, as for that matter, there was no need for it at the time, a few years ago, when the original item was embodied in the appropriation bill. It never should have been in here, and if now stricken out the only ones hurt by it will be certain favorites who are now holding the places. You may be sure no injustice will be done any soldier by unnecessarily delaying action on his claim for pension or increase of pension.

Mr. Chairman, I charge—and there may be some men on this floor who will deny it, but I assert it as a fact, and no man on the Appropriations Committee will deny it—originally the places created by this item was rank patronage, nothing but patronage, intended to serve Members of Congress rather than to serve the old soldier. And now, when the recommendation has been made to discontinue this in the interests of economy, a motion is made here to embody it in the permanent law. And, as a matter of fact, gentlemen, I know full well that this amendment will be voted up. You will adopt it; and as a matter of fact it would have been adopted just as easily if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN] had moved to put in thirty-two instead of sixteen persons on this board.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I am sure the gentleman from Texas does not wish to make a misstatement.

Mr. BURLESON. No; I never do if I know myself.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I say I am sure of it. Hence the gentleman will allow me to correct him when he says the purpose of this amendment is to enact this additional force into permanent law. It is simply for one year, to enable the work to be brought up.

Mr. BURLESON. And the gentleman, who has been upon the Committee on Appropriations for many years, knows—yes, out of the storehouse of his experience there can be had a certain knowledge—that when once an item finds place in an appropriation bill it is nearly impossible to get the item out.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to address myself for one moment to the necessity for this Board. There are 1,700 cases now pending on appeal; and about 800 new appeals every month. The information that comes to us is that this Board disposes of about 800 cases a month. No wonder they do not bring the business

abreast of current work. Here we have the sixteen members of this Board, each disposing of about one case a day, or, to be perfectly accurate, one and five twenty-sixths, or one and two-thirteenths cases each day. Of course it is not to their interest to work themselves out of a fat job. Yet, Mr. Chairman, every lawyer of intelligence here knows that these cases come to this Board thoroughly briefed, and the most complicated of them ought to be easily disposed of in one hour's time. It would be curious, Mr. Chairman, if we could ascertain just where the various men who hold these places and who are to be appointed come from. I doubt not a flood of light would be turned upon this discussion, and really we could then understand matters just as they are.

I stand here to confirm every word that has been uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER], and I stand here to assert that there is absolutely no necessity for the continuation of this Board one day longer, much less convert it into a permanent Board by adopting this amendment. They could all be abolished without any fear of doing the old soldiers an act of injustice.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman who has just taken his seat says that he stands here to confirm every word uttered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER]. That gentleman says that the records show that the board, continued as is proposed by the committee, would amply dispose of the pension-appeal cases. I beg to say that that statement can not be confirmed, and I want to say, in the hearing of the gentleman from New York, that he received from the Interior Department a letter, which he never presented to the committee and never referred to here, which shows that that statement is absolutely untrue. Does the gentleman dispute that?

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KEIFER. Yes. Do you dispute that? I have the letter here.

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will permit me, the question as to the correctness of the statement that the Board as composed would amply dispose of the pension-appeal cases is simply an inference. The letter was a personal letter, reinforcing somewhat the testimony which the Assistant Secretary gave as printed in the hearings. It was not an official communication. In my rehearsal of the facts in connection with this matter before the full committee I read to the committee every single figure that was in that letter, and the gentleman from Ohio sat there, perhaps listening and perhaps not.

Mr. KEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I beg to say that the letter was never read there, or the gentleman would not have made the statement just made. That letter shows that for the months of July, August, September, October, and November, 1906, the appeals filed were 4,120, and the appeals disposed of were 3,984, less by about 200 than the appeals filed, without going to the old cases in arrears at all. Does that justify the statement that a board that would dispose of three-fifths as many as have been disposed of in the past five months could keep up promptly?

Mr. LITTAUER. I should like to ask the gentleman a question. Can he explain to me why this same Board in the year ending June 30, 1906, disposed of 10,173 cases, while in the previous year, with the same number of men on the Board, it disposed of 13,715?

Mr. KEIFER. The question contains an error. The same Board did not exist before this fiscal year by a great way. The Board before this time you refer to consisted of thirty-two instead of twenty-eight, added to by two men detailed from the Attorney-General's office and a man from the Land Office to help them, thus adding three more to the efficiency of the Board.

Mr. LITTAUER. The gentleman wants to state the facts correctly?

Mr. KEIFER. The facts I gave in my speech a few days ago. You had an opportunity to show by the statement of the Assistant Secretary of the Interior that it would not be possible for you to cut the Board down as is proposed and ever get in sight of clearing up the pension appeals. We would run behind in one year about 4,000 at least. We had also on the 1st day of December arrears, according to this letter of December 6 to the gentleman from New York, of 1,776 appeals. Now, somebody says the appealed cases come briefed. Surely that is a very nice statement. If you are asking for a case to come briefed against the old soldier who appeals, and then ask the person who is reviewing to decide it on the brief that is made up to reject his claim, well and good. But it has to be rebriefed by some member of the Board and then taken to another portion of the twenty-eight, and finally be reviewed before the whole Board. It is not one man sitting as an appeal board, but you have to

rebrief it, and the larger the record the greater the labor. That is the way justice is often done to these old soldiers. Now, there is nothing anywhere in the record that justifies the statement that the Board continued as last year, with twelve permanent and sixteen additional members, will be able to keep up with the filed appealed cases when thirteen of the members are dropped, and we will certainly make no mistake if we leave it as it was the last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pension Office: For the Commissioner of Pensions, \$5,000; First Deputy Commissioner, \$3,600; Second Deputy Commissioner, \$3,600; chief clerk, \$2,250; assistant chief clerk, \$2,000; medical referee, \$3,000; assistant medical referee, \$2,250; 2 qualified surgeons who shall be experts in their profession, at \$2,000 each; 35 medical examiners who shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, at \$1,800 each; 9 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; law clerk, \$2,250; chief of board of review, \$2,250; 55 principal examiners, at \$2,000 each; private secretary, to be selected and appointed by the Commissioner of Pensions, \$2,000; 18 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,800 each; 3 stenographers, at \$1,600 each; 69 clerks of class 4; 85 clerks of class 3; 265 clerks of class 2; 335 clerks of class 1; 200 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 94 copyists; superintendent of building, \$1,400; 2 engineers, at \$1,200 each; 3 firemen; 27 messengers; 12 assistant messengers; 20 messenger boys, at \$400 each; 43 laborers; 10 female laborers, at \$400 each; 15 charwomen; 1 painter, skilled in his trade, \$900; 1 cabinetmaker, skilled in his trade, \$900; captain of the watch, \$840; 3 sergeants of the watch, at \$750 each; 20 watchmen; in all, \$1,678,750.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 114, line 23, strike out the words "two hundred and sixty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred;" in line 24 strike out the words "three hundred and thirty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the words "three hundred and seventy;" in line 25 strike out the words "two hundred" and insert the words "one hundred and sixty-five." On page 115, line 1, strike out the word "ninety-four" and insert the word "sixty-nine;" and in lines 12 and 13 strike out the words "six hundred and seventy-eight thousand seven hundred and fifty" and insert the words "seven hundred and three thousand two hundred and fifty."

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the bill provides for thirty-five men of class 1 and thirty-five men of class 2—

Mr. LITTAUER. If I may be allowed, the Commissioner advised us that we could reduce the number of clerks in the service, and this is in the line of his recommendation.

Mr. MANN. I thought this was an increase.

Mr. BINGHAM. No; it is a decrease.

Mr. LITTAUER. It is the elimination of seventy clerks. The committee reported to eliminate thirty-five at \$1,400 and thirty-five at \$1,200. The purpose of the amendment is to eliminate thirty-five out of the \$1,000 class and thirty-five out of the \$900 class instead of as at first proposed.

The amendment was considered and agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

No vacancy now existing in the clerical or other classified service of the Pension Office, or which may occur after March 1, 1907, and prior to July 1, 1908, shall be filled by original appointment or by transfer from any other office or bureau of the Department of the Interior. Nor shall any transfers from said Pension Office existing March 1, 1907, be returned to said Office.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 14, on page 115, strike out the words "or other classified," and in line 17 strike out the word "eight" and insert in lieu thereof the word "seven."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Patent Office: For the Commissioner of Patents, \$5,000; Assistant Commissioner, who shall perform such duties pertaining to the office of Commissioner as may be assigned to him by the Commissioner, \$3,000; chief clerk, \$2,500; 2 law clerks, at \$2,500 each; 3 examiners in chief, at \$3,000 each; examiner of interferences, \$2,500; examiner of trade-marks and designs, \$2,500; 41 principal examiners, at \$2,500 each; 53 first assistant examiners, at \$1,800 each; 63 second assistant examiners, at \$1,600 each; 73 third assistant examiners, at \$1,400 each; 83 fourth assistant examiners, at \$1,200 each; financial clerk, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, \$2,250; librarian, \$2,000; 6 chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; additional to 1 chief of division in charge of the Official Gazette, \$250; 3 assistant chiefs of division, at \$1,800 each; 7 clerks of class 4, one of whom shall act as application clerk; machinist, \$1,600; 7 clerks of class 3, one of whom shall be translator of languages; 15 clerks of class 2; 70 clerks of class 1; skilled laborer, \$1,200; 3 skilled draftsmen, at \$1,200 each; 4 draftsmen, at \$1,000 each; 57 permanent clerks, at \$1,000 each; messenger and property clerk, \$1,000; 107 copyists, seven of whom may be copyists of drawings; 31 copyists, at \$720 each; 3 messengers; 25 assistant messengers; 51 laborers, at \$600 each; 50 laborers, at \$480 each; 39 messenger boys, at \$360 each; in all, \$956,880.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 118, in lines 2 and 3, strike out "machinist, \$1,000;" in line 8 strike out "fifty-seven" and insert "sixty-two;" and after the word "clerk" insert "including five heretofore designated model attendants;" in line 10 strike out "one hundred and seven" and insert "one hundred and six;" in line 11, after the word "drawings," insert "ten clerks heretofore designated model attendants, at \$800 each," and strike out "thirty-one" and insert "thirty;" in line 14 strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-eight;" and in lines 16 and 17 strike out "fifty-six thousand eight hundred and eighty" and insert in lieu thereof "sixty-five thousand seven hundred."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and the amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND LABOR.

Office of the Secretary: For compensation of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, \$8,000; Assistant Secretary, \$5,000; private secretary to the Secretary, \$2,500; confidential clerk to the Secretary, \$1,600; private secretary to the Assistant Secretary, \$1,800; chief clerk and superintendent, \$3,000; disbursing clerk, \$2,750; chief of appointment division, \$2,250; two chiefs of division, at \$2,000 each; ten clerks of class 4 (including one census clerk); ten clerks of class 3; twelve clerks of class 2; ten clerks of class 1; ten clerks, at \$1,000 each; five clerks, at \$900 each; two telegraph operators, at \$1,200 each; five messengers; nine assistant messengers; seven messenger boys, at \$480 each; one engineer, \$1,000; one skilled laborer, \$840; two conductors of elevators, at \$720 each; two firemen, at \$660 each; nine laborers; one packer, \$840; one driver and foreman of stables, \$840; six hostlers, at \$660 each; one cabinetmaker, \$1,000; one carpenter, \$900; captain of the watch, \$1,200; six watchmen; fifteen charwomen; in all, \$151,840.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk, and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 15, on page 143, insert:

"For compensation of not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of the markets for cotton products, and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Unless objection is made, I shall ask for a vote on that amendment.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, which I send to the desk, and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$750,000, not more than \$25,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of the markets for any one of the following articles:

Cotton and manufactures thereof, wool and manufactures thereof, leather and manufactures thereof, boots and shoes, wood and manufactures thereof, glass and manufactures thereof, iron and manufactures thereof, flax and manufactures thereof, steel and manufactures thereof, copper and manufactures thereof, automobiles, sewing machines, typewriters, firearms, hardware, cutlery, agricultural implements, corn, hay, wheat, potatoes, barley, tobacco, sugar, rice, cattle, eggs, swine, beets, onions; and the reports of such special agents shall be published by Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is the debate upon the substitute amendment first?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard briefly in favor of that amendment. The usual appropriation was left out by the committee this year, of some \$50,000—

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to raise the point of order on the substitute.

Several MEMBERS. That is too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is too late, debate having been passed.

Mr. SULLIVAN. In the last bill \$50,000 was appropriated for the investigation of foreign markets, with a view of increasing the commerce of the United States. In the previous bill \$30,000 was carried, so that \$80,000 has been authorized and probably spent for the investigation of these markets. In order that the House may not think that all this has been without fruit, I hold up for your inspection all of the reports which have been made so far, and which represent the \$80,000 which has been expended. Here is the \$80,000 worth. I offer that as an exhibit, in order to indicate to the House how many more reports we might get, excellently written and in much greater bulk, if we should appropriate what I ask for, namely, \$750,000. And to show that there is an absolute need of appropriating this money, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the statement made by Mr. Carson, of the Department of Commerce and Labor. He speaks of the great and dense ignorance of the

American manufacturer concerning the conditions of trade in Europe and the rest of the world.

That is illustrated by this remark:

It is to exploit those facts and to inform our people as to the wants and requirements of foreign markets that our efforts are being directed. When made acquainted with these conditions our manufacturers and merchants will not send skates to the Tropics and fur goods to Jamaica.

Now, I suppose there are some merchants and manufacturers in the United States who know what the temperature of the Tropics is, but they never had a realizing sense of the facts until they were incorporated in an official statement. We all know that unofficial statements concerning trade conditions, such as are gathered by merchants and their agents, are of absolutely no value to men who have goods to sell, and that the only fact worth considering is the fact that is stated in a solemn document prepared under the auspices of one of the officials of the United States. So that hereafter as one result of the publication of these reports, which have cost \$80,000 already, we will understand officially that there is no ice in the Tropics upon which people of that country may skate and there is no necessity for fur cloaks and boas. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Is it necessary to have ice always in order to skate?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I do not know what the conditions in the Tropics are, but I assure the gentleman it is not necessary in Chicago.

Mr. MANN. We know that.

Mr. SULLIVAN. It is a worthy purpose, Mr. Chairman, and if the money of the country is going to be spent, as I think it will be, there is no better way than to develop the foreign commerce of this country. For a great many years, under the influence of protective tariffs, the attention of our producers, of our farmers, and manufacturers was concentrated almost exclusively upon the home market. Now, having control of the home market in such manner as to call for such investigations as have been propounded here to-day—for instance, the investigation of the lumber trust—it now becomes necessary to turn our eyes away from local conditions and see what we may sell in the rest of the world. It is a subject that will take a long time to investigate, as the answer of Mr. Carson shows. He was asked by Mr. LITTAUER, of the committee:

How many years will it take to complete this investigation?

Mr. CARSON. You will find in these reports [handing to members of the committee printed reports] the kind of work we are doing.

Then Mr. LITTAUER proceeded:

Mr. Carson, here you have special agents whose object is the extension of the foreign commerce of the United States. Of course the field is almost unlimited, is it not?

Mr. CARSON. Yes; it is without limit.

So we have the assurance that if this beneficent work is continued in a manner befitting the dignity and glory of this great American nation that it will last for all time and consume a considerable portion of the public revenues. I for one should much prefer to see the money of the country spent in the development of our foreign commerce than spent in building a great navy or maintaining a great standing army. I should prefer to see much of it spent in the development of our rivers and harbors, and in the same line of reasoning considerable money could be well spent in the development of our foreign commerce.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Now, I know that some Member who objects to the expenditure of such a large sum as three-quarters of a million dollars for this excellent purpose may say that these special agents are not of any value to the country. The contradiction is found here. Here are the reports. They speak for themselves. They are excellently written, some of them by skilled newspaper men, who have found a great deal of material worth reporting and who have compiled it in a most excellent fashion. I know that some men will say these men ought to be experts in particular lines, and no others should be appointed, but if you have experts in the manufacture of cotton and other articles you will not have such beautiful and finished literary productions as you will when you send newspaper men abroad to do this work, and that is something which should merit the consideration of the House.

I know that some men will object still further and say that much of the information gathered by these special agents, for which I trust we will appropriate \$750,000 more, is material that could be just as well collected by the members of our con-

sular service, and they will argue that the consular service has recently been improved, or is about to be improved, as a result of the excellent legislation of last year. I grant that. I believe it is a fact, accepted by all, that when special agents do go abroad the first thing they do is to consult the resident consul in the particular district which they are exploring and get from him all the information he has upon the subject. But the fact still remains that these consuls can not make reports of such literary excellence as our special agents, and for that reason I think this work ought to be continued.

Now, then, I do not believe that cotton should be singled out for the expenditure of a large sum of money, and I have extended the list so that it includes thirty articles, all of them produced in the United States and equally entitled to the protection of the American flag and to an appropriation. No one can say upon this floor with any degree of confidence that we ought to spend the money of the country for the development of the market for cotton or boots and shoes exclusively. A Member has suggested, after hearing my list read, that I showed a great lack of local pride in failing to insert in my list the item of Boston baked beans. [Laughter.] He said that that was an article which should be sent abroad, and which undoubtedly would improve conditions in the world generally outside of the United States and in the city of Boston in particular. But in order that I might not be accused of any selfish local pride, I omitted that important article from my list and devoted my attention to some things equally meritorious.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Will the gentleman tell the committee how much money the Government of the United States has been spending in this magnificent work?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thirty thousand dollars in the bill the year before last and \$50,000 last year.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. What would you call this agent that you speak of? A drummer?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would call him the "advance agent of prosperity." [Laughter.] He is sent abroad in order to ascertain conditions—

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. All the drummers are that. I never saw a drummer in my life that did not think that prosperity was ahead of him or just behind him.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are called "special agents" in the bill.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Special agents of whom? Some private firm?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] asks for five minutes more. Is there objection. There was no objection.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee rose.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Does this gentleman represent the Government of the United States as such or some private firm?

Mr. SULLIVAN. The gentleman represents the Government of the United States in general and the Treasury of the United States in particular. The information which he collects is, of course, published to the world, and our manufacturers get the benefit of it. I have not observed, as a result of these investigations, that our commerce has increased materially; but the work is still young. It is still only an infant industry, and it ought to get proper encouragement. In process of time it will unquestionably show the merits of the enterprise.

Now, I have asked twenty-five thousand for boots and shoes, which are articles of great importance all the world over. The people of the world are entitled to know the merits of American-made boots and shoes. And so on through wood and its manufactures, and sewing machines, typewriters, firearms, hardware, cutlery, and also a great many products of the farm. I find, for example, that corn leads the list in the last year's production. Corn is an article of even greater value in the domestic economy of the United States than cotton. I find that the production of corn is twelve hundred and sixteen millions according to the last report. Then, too, hay is ahead of cotton, the value being six hundred and five millions. Cotton comes third, with five hundred and seventy-five millions, and wheat follows a close fourth, with five hundred and twenty-five millions, and oats, two hundred and eighty-two millions, and so on. I have put all of these worthy and deserving articles in the list because I believe they are entitled to consideration equally with cotton. I would not neglect other articles. Take the American hog, for example. He is finding it extremely difficult to enter the markets of Europe, particularly of Germany. All sorts of discriminating laws are made against him. What could be better than to have

expert agents of the United States go to Germany and find out how conditions might be improved, so as to facilitate the entrance—I might say, grease the passage—of the American hog, so that the sale of hog products might be greater in Germany than it is to-day. [Laughter.] Then there are other articles of the farm. Take beets, for example. Why should not the American beet be extolled abroad by our agents?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are paying three millions now to send it abroad.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Let us pay more. If it is a good thing, we can not have too much of it. Then take the onion. There is a patient and humble American vegetable just as much entitled, in my judgment, to the protection of the flag and as much entitled to an appropriation as is cotton. What patriot is there who can not feel the rush of blood to his face and moisture to his eyes when he speaks of the American onion? [Laughter.] Would it not sweeten Europe, Asia, and other parts of the world in its passage around the globe? What more patriotic mission could there be than to send a special agent abroad with the American flag in his right hand and the American onion in his left hand? [Laughter.]

Mr. STANLEY. What about the hen?

Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes; what about the hen? I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. I find that the Secretary of Agriculture has stated in a solemn document that "the farmer's hen has become a worthy companion to his cow. The annual production of eggs is now a score of billions." There is the egg industry. See that we send an agent abroad to find a market for our eggs, and even for our decayed eggs. Why, it was rumored not long ago that they were treated with formaldehyde, put in barrels, and sent to China.

I remember some years ago an American actor, speaking of eyewater, said that he could buy it at 50 cents a barrel and sell it in China at a dollar a bottle, and that there were "millions in it." There are millions in this also. So our decayed-egg industry should be fostered. Why not find a legitimate outlet for the decayed eggs, instead of allowing them to remain a sort of fluid criticism upon American dramatic art? [Laughter.] Who can not see the picture of the Orient waiting with outstretched arms and, perhaps, bowed head, calling for the introduction of the decayed eggs of the United States? I might extend the list indefinitely, but I assure gentlemen this amendment ought to pass, in the interest of American industries. There is not one of these articles which could be called unpatriotic; not one of them but which is entitled to an appropriation as much as cotton and other articles which are specifically enumerated. Let these agents be appointed; let the appropriation go on, and after a while, under the civilizing influence of our beets, our onions, and our decayed eggs, we will not find it necessary longer to appropriate for great navies; we will have conquered the world with our products; and therefore I beg a respectful consideration by this House for this amendment. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think, Mr. Chairman, from first to last, the remarks of my colleague on the committee have been quite unkind, in attempting to ridicule this amendment of mine off the floor of the House. Ridicule is not argument. It may be in harmony with his practice before petty juries in the courtroom, but is not worth anything on the floor of this House.

Mr. Chairman, over half of the articles he mentions are already exploited abroad by special appropriations. Beef, mutton, butter, corn and corn bread, hen and hen fruit, and all that, have been cared for by the Secretary of Agriculture to a very great extent, and a product of this country which for the last five years—three out of five—has paid the balance in export trade against the United States is cotton. It has been settled by cotton, and the money furnished to prevent a financial panic in the United States, yet he compares that product to the juice from rotten eggs [laughter]—another Massachusetts product [laughter]—and Boston beans.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I would share its benefit with the whole world; I was not so selfish as the gentleman.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, the committee, in the preparation of this bill, saw proper to put in an appropriation for, or recommendation for, \$30,000 this year. Now, the gentleman can still, if the limit is put back in the bill and the amendment prevails, can still go to the Secretary of Commerce and Labor with this list and have them all attended to.

Mr. SULLIVAN. There would not be enough money.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. This law was \$30,000 last year; the current appropriation is \$50,000. But \$20,000 was added by an amendment in the Senate covering cotton products; and I am going to show you who are interested in cotton products, and you ought to take care of it. All I have asked is a reinstatement of the current law in the bill. Now, why should that

amendment of mine be attacked as if it was a scheme, if you wish to call it a scheme, as the gentleman from Boston seems to think it is. It is not giving a fair chance to the tax payer of the United States as to whether it is proper to be expended in this way or not. The gentleman holds up in his hand a great body of reports of the special agents, and does not show how the expenditure of \$80,000 has benefited this country.

I say that if you will read these reports you will see that our special agents, sent abroad to enlarge and broaden the trade of this country, have been very efficient and useful.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman particularize?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Another Boston man. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, if I had more than ten or fifteen minutes I would take these reports and particularize, but the gentleman from New York knew that no man could do it under the five-minute rule when he put the proposition up to me. I say this appropriation ought to be continued, so as to give this scheme, if you call it a scheme, a fair deal. I stand in my place on the floor of this House and declare that these reports sustain the argument I am making, without particularizing, and I leave it with the gentleman from New York, if he can get the time, to particularize.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I ask unanimous consent for ten minutes in order to make me even up with the Boston party.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended ten minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Now, let us see about the necessity. I shall have to be brief about it. We produce 70 per cent of the raw cotton of the world. England produces 64 per cent of the cotton fabrics of the world. I have not the time to dwell on that. Let me repeat it, and you take it home with you. We produce in the United States 70 per cent of all the raw cotton of the world. England produces 64 per cent of all the cotton goods of the world. England exports annually \$447,657,600 of cotton fabrics. The United States, that produces 70 per cent of the raw cotton, sends abroad \$55,189,700 in cotton goods; \$55,000,000 against \$447,000,000. Is it not about time that Asia and Africa knew that we have cotton and cotton mills in this country, and can manufacture and sell cotton goods cheaper than England? That is the object of this amendment.

Listen! In 1905 England sold to Asia \$202,212,600 worth of cotton goods. The United States sold in Asia only \$36,988,200 worth of manufactured cotton. There were \$36,000,000 of our cotton fabrics going to Asia against \$202,000,000 of English goods going to Asia. How did they get that trade? By doing just what I propose in this amendment. That is how they got it, they went after it like the nigger went after the Christmas turkey. He got it because he went after it.

Again, Africa took from England last year \$29,456,100 in cotton goods, and she took from us \$428,200. There is a difference of \$29,000,000 that Africa took from England more than she took from us. South America, right at our doors, took from England last year \$32,002,800, and took from us \$3,476,500, a difference of \$28,000,000 that England sold right at our doors more than we sold of manufactured cotton goods. Canada and Mexico took from England five times as much cotton goods as they took from the United States in 1905. Think of it. Mexico on our south Canada on our north, and both on our borders, took five times as much manufactured cotton from England as from the United States. Let any man look at these figures, which are all official, and he will see that when we have one crop worth from five to six hundred million dollars, and only a small per cent of it manufactured within the limits of the United States and 64 per cent of it manufactured in England—if any man looking at this fact will tell me that it is not time for the United States to get a part of that trade or all of it, then I am mistaken in the man. He must be from Boston. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, when I offered that amendment I intended to insert three words between "cotton" and the word "products," and those words were "and cotton-seed;" but knowing the amendments the gentlemen had to propose, and knowing them to be outside of the current law, I refrained, because it would open the gates to the gentleman from Boston, and to every other gentleman, to put into the current law foolish, ridiculous amendments such as my friend from Boston has proposed here to-day. I ask for nothing except the current law.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. May I ask the gentleman a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I do.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Does not your amendment provide specifically for the investigation of trade conditions and

the extension of the trade of the United States in other products besides cotton and its manufactures?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to say that there is \$30,000 that absolutely covers the very articles mentioned by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. That is the point, and only \$20,000 of the \$50,000 goes for the investigation and extension of the cotton trade in foreign markets.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I desire in the time allowed me to give my hearty indorsement to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON]. The effort, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] makes in regard to this question in opposition to the desired appropriation is to use the shaft of ridicule. That always reacts against a man who attempts to use it on a subject as grave and of such magnitude as this. The gentleman from Massachusetts certainly does not know, and if he does know he can not appreciate it, that for this one product, for this one staple of cotton, Europe pays us annually more than all the gold developed and mined annually in the world. It is true that this enormous amount for one staple goes into the lap of the South.

And yet the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] stands here in the presence of this House and facetiously and flippantly compares this gigantic article of the world's commerce with "rotten eggs" and "onions." Does he know, Mr. Chairman, when he talks in this spirit of idle ridicule, that every day, including Sundays and holidays, Great Britain for our raw cotton is paying the cotton producer of the United States more than \$1,000,000? And yet his purpose, in an effort to display his native wit, is to underestimate and belittle, if you please, this great southern product that is destined in the development of the South to clothe the people of all the world who wear clothes and are civilized. I have thought, among Democrats and Republicans, regardless of place of residence, the sentiment prevailed that we should expand and extend our trade with foreign countries.

No man on the floor of this House is more in favor of such a policy than I am. Why not prepare to meet the inevitable demands of the world for cotton cloth? We are bound to have an outlet for this great and valuable crop. The Eastern States as well as the Southern States are alike interested in the manufacture of cotton. It is true the South produces quite 80 per cent of the raw cotton that supplies the world, and the South, to the amazement of the world, is now manufacturing about one-half of the cloth manufactured in the United States. Great sections of the world await the new exportation and the extension of our cotton-fabric trade.

There stands China, with more than 450,000,000 of people, awaiting to-day the cotton cloth and clothing which is the joint product of the mills of the South and East. We see that Great Britain buys from us raw cotton, manufacturing it, and by tactful methods in foreign countries governs that great trade throughout the world that the United States ought to-day to control and will control in the near future if we will be broad enough to give our cotton a fair chance. There stands Japan, a great, growing, and aspiring country that has recently entered on the stage of the great nations of the world, with 45,000,000 of people who can use our cotton. Great Britain is extending the tentacles of her trade greed and will soon have in her grasp the cotton-cloth interests and demands of that people. It is the proper time for us to seek this developing trade in Japan. If we lose it, the completion of the Panama Canal will lose many of its commercial advantages for the South. Let us understand the proposition submitted to us and then apply the wit and humor in the remarks made by the gentleman from Massachusetts. It is this: The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] moves to reinsert in the bill the provision that calls for an appropriation of \$50,000 "to investigate trade conditions abroad," to promote our foreign commerce, but only \$20,000 of this amount shall be used to investigate foreign markets in the interest of cotton products. It appears that the \$30,000 appropriation ought to be sufficient to investigate foreign markets in the interest of "rotten eggs and onions."

Why, Mr. Chairman, there can be no comparison with any one single product that is made in the United States to this great one of the product of cotton and its manufacture. I insist, Mr. Chairman, not in any spirit of sectionalism, not in any spirit except that which is broad and patriotic, that we ought to investigate matters of this kind, for such investigations will add to the commercial growth of our Republic. We ought to send skilled and trained men to these markets that we can develop—men who can tell us what the existing conditions are, what the customs are, and what kind and character of cotton

cloths we ought to send to that country and what kind would suit the tastes of those people, so that it will increase and advance our trade there. I insist that the provision offered by the gentleman from Georgia should be reinserted in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, of course the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] will be voted down, because it was offered for the purpose of being voted down. But I do sincerely hope the members of this committee will not treat the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] with ridicule. It is entitled to serious consideration, and when you come to vote upon it, and you will do so, if you vote down a substitute which will later be offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] it is my purpose to offer an amendment to the amendment, adding after the words "cotton products" the words "and cotton-seed products."

The amendment as amended would then read as follows:

For compensation, at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses, of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products and cotton-seed products, and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress.

I can give reasons why I think the amendment as amended should go into this bill, and these reasons are not at all inconsistent with the views expressed by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I concur generally in the propositions laid down by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] that it is the duty of the consular officers to develop the trade of the United States. I recognize that the service of each of our consular officers, regardless of the State from which he is appointed, belongs alike to all the States, but at the same time I submit in all fairness that each section should be given a just and fair proportion of these appointments, in order that we may have those in our consular service who are thoroughly familiar with the resources and industries of the various sections of our country.

I also contend that these consular officers from the different sections should be stationed in those countries with which the citizens of the particular section have established trade relations or where there is a hope of developing or extending their trade. 'Tis true a consular officer is a commercial agent whose duty it is to advance the commercial interests of the country he represents and of the individual citizen of the country he represents, but to do so we all will admit he must have a particular knowledge of the industry which he endeavors to promote, and it is for that very reason that I urge upon the committee to put this item in this bill. Now, why?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURLESON. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Agreeing with the gentleman as to the appropriation, I would like to ask him this question: How is it possible for the special agents appointed to differentiate between the work they do for cotton, cotton seed, and cotton fabrics and the work they do for other items, each one being engaged in a country by itself, observing the trade relations of that country, and making a general report upon the trade of that country?

Mr. BURLESON. I suppose agents will be appointed who are thoroughly familiar with the cotton-seed oil industry and who know something about where additional markets for the same could probably be found. It is to secure such services, which can not be rendered by our present consular officers, that I contend for the continuance of this appropriation. Mr. Chairman, that is the very reason why this item ought to go into this bill.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I will just state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] that there were two men specially appointed for cotton, and they did not mix up with anything else.

Mr. BURLESON. I do not want my time consumed by further interruption, because my time is limited and I have several suggestions which I desire to offer this committee in support of this item. As a matter of fact—and I do not say this now in a partisan sense; I desire to emphasize the assurance that I am not stating what I now propose to state in a partisan sense—as a matter of fact, there is not to-day a consular officer in the service of the United States who knows anything whatever about the manufacture of cotton-seed products, who is located where there is even a remote chance to widen a market for same or aid in extending its uses or assist in increasing a demand for same. The truth is we have for the entire eleven Southern States, the cotton and cotton-seed oil producing States, only fourteen consular officers—fourteen for that entire section, while Massachusetts alone has nineteen.

And, Mr. Chairman, the fourteen consular officers who have been selected from the cotton States have been sent to obscure points in Central or South America, or Bergen, Norway, or some other point with which the great agricultural South has no trade relations. I will admit that it is the duty of our consular officer who hails from Massachusetts (many of whom are stationed in Europe, where the cotton and cotton-seed oil interests are important) to further the commercial interest of the South and the commercial interests of the individual citizens of that section; but, Mr. Chairman, this they can not properly do. They might, as far as cotton products are concerned, but I assert they can not so do with reference to cotton-seed products, for they are wanting in knowledge of the industry.

I do not mean to reflect upon our consular officers. Of course they represent all parts and all interests of the United States. I believe they are the best in the world, but those in Europe, where this great interest is involved, have no knowledge of cotton-seed products, and consequently can not represent its merits. New York can oppose this, but it is not becoming in her Representatives to do so, because New York has thirty-seven of her citizens abroad as consular officers to represent the commercial interests of that State, to exploit the manufactured wares of that great Commonwealth, and they do it, and do it well, and I am glad of it; but why should she now oppose this item which affects the great staple crop of the South?

Mr. Chairman, can I be excused if I take one moment to speak of the value of the great staple to be affected by this amendment? It is undoubtedly true that cotton is the most important crop grown in all this great country. But for this crop, instead of being one of the leading, if not the leading, creditor countries of the world, we would, when the balance of the world's trade is struck, find ourselves each year on the wrong side of the ledger. This great crop furnishes full 90 per cent of the balance of trade in our favor. The hoard of gold now piled high in the vaults of our Treasury bears silent witness to the service rendered by cotton in bringing this precious metal from foreign shores.

Mr. Chairman, millions of dollars are appropriated each year for the support of our consular service, and, as I have shown, of the 300 consular officers all the South has only 14, and these are located where they can be of but little service, and now, when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] by this amendment asks for the pitiful sum of \$20,000 to exploit a by-product of its great crop, of which no consular officer, located where its interests are affected, now in the service of the United States knows one single thing, he is met with ridicule—with ridicule by a gentleman who hails from Massachusetts, a State that has in our consular service five more representatives than are to be found in the entire eleven States interested in this product.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. BURLESON. Certainly. I have no objection, if my time can be extended to enable me to conclude what I desire to say on this subject.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to ask the gentleman if these officials coming from Massachusetts and New York, or any of them, were appointed to represent any particular industry?

Mr. BURLESON. Not at all. On the contrary, I disclaimed that they were there to represent particularly the wares of New York, but at the same time, being from New York, I say that they are thoroughly familiar with the wares of New York and thus splendidly equipped to promote her commercial interests.

Mr. NORRIS. Then why should we appoint anyone to represent any particular industry, cotton or any other?

Mr. BURLESON. I have not so contended, as a general proposition, and if the gentleman had given attention to what I have stated he would not have consumed my time by asking such a question or interjecting such a statement. I have clearly announced that it is the duty of our consular officers to represent every section, and every interest of every section, of the United States, and I have also said they were doing it as well as they could. But, Mr. Chairman, our consuls located in Europe do not have a proper knowledge of this industry because of conditions I have described, and for that reason we are asking that \$20,000 be set apart to exploit this particular industry, and we found our contention upon the broad basis of right. We have a right to ask it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BURLESON. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for a few moments longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, this is a peculiar industry—the cotton-seed-oil industry. No consular officer living be-

yond the limits of the South can possibly have that knowledge of it which will enable him to properly represent its merits. It has heretofore found its principal, if not its sole, market in Europe, or rather, I should say, in certain countries in Europe—England, France, Germany, Italy, and Austria-Hungary. We have no consular officer there with even fair knowledge of it. This is one reason why I contend that this item should go into this bill.

This industry now has \$73,000,000 invested in it and 715 different plants engaged in its manufacture. Last year the product was excluded from Austria by a prohibitive tax. It has been practically excluded from Germany, and now France threatens to exclude it. Recent cablegrams from Paris clearly indicate a purpose on the part of the customs committee of the Chamber of Deputies to increase the tariff charge on cotton seed and cotton-seed oil to so high a figure that it would amount to exclusion. So imminent is this danger that the ambassador from this country to France, Mr. McCormick, has made strong representations against the proposed increase.

Mr. Chairman, as is well known to us all, a very advantageous reciprocity treaty which had been negotiated with France by Mr. Kasson, under the provisions of the Dingley Act, was pigeonholed at the other end of the Capitol. That treaty, it is believed, would have proven especially advantageous to the cotton producer. In fact, it is claimed that it would have been worth millions of dollars to those interested in that great staple. But, Mr. Chairman, we did not get it, and we all know we will not get a reciprocity treaty with France. The particular treaty was sidetracked, so it is said, because it happened to affect very slightly certain knitted goods manufactured in Massachusetts. Such being the case, regardless of the enormous benefit to be conferred on the millions who produce cotton and cotton seed, a distinguished Senator from Massachusetts saw that the treaty was not ratified.

I am not making any complaint about it. That matter is passed, but I do believe it my duty to insist that because the interests of this product are being sidetracked in this way that we are entitled to ask of the Congress the pittance carried in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

It is now our only hope of accomplishing anything for this industry, for not only have we failed in the past to secure relief through reciprocity, but there is no hope of doing anything along that line in the future.

The reciprocity bureau of the State Department has been abandoned, and evidently there is no purpose to attempt anything further in that direction.

I submit in this connection a part of the hearings on this bill before your Appropriation Committee and you can determine for yourself the chances for action from that quarter. I read from the statement made by the honorable Secretary of State:

LACK OF EXPERT ASSISTANCE.

Secretary Root. There is particularly a lack of force in what we call the bureau of trade relations. You will remember that there was a reciprocity bureau, and that when I talked with you a year ago we talked about the expenses of the reciprocity bureau, of which Mr. Kasson had been the head, and of which Mr. Coleman was secretary and practical chief under Mr. Kasson. That is gone now. That expense had been paid out of an emergency fund, and we abandoned that in the process of reforming our salaries, with general consent.

There is a great amount of work to be done—work that we have got to have done in the State Department. It is part of a pretty wide subject, and I do not know that I ought to take up your time with it, but it may be worth while for me to say a few words. We are very lame and very undeveloped in our governmental organization in respect to expert assistance. We have just sent over to Germany, for the purpose of reaching an understanding upon facts and an understanding of the relative ideas of the two countries on the subject of the tariff, three experts, and I had to go around and pick them up and get them as a matter of special favor from the Treasury Department and the Department of Commerce, and we have added a consul-general—Mr. Mason—who has gone over to Berlin from Paris to give them the benefit of his assistance. They met in Berlin a force of nine experts connected with the foreign office, whose entire and continuous business is to keep the Government of Germany up to date all the time upon every commercial question.

Mr. LITTAUER. You have not a like force in your Department?

Secretary Root. There is no such force here.

Mr. BURLESON. Is there any necessity for such a force? Germany is constantly engaged in negotiating reciprocity treaties with various countries. That is the very character of business they are engaged in. They are the experts about whom Secretary Root speaks.

Secretary Root. We are exporting \$1,750,000,000 worth of goods, and all of those except those going to Great Britain herself are going to countries that have tariffs imposed upon our goods, and there is no country in the world that so much needs intelligent and expert knowledge on all tariff questions as this country now, at this very time.

Mr. LITTAUER. Tariff questions from the standpoint of those countries we are dealing with?

Secretary Root. Yes.

Mr. BURLESON. To do what, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Root. To enable us, in the first place, to make the necessary representations to those countries which will prevent their imposing disadvantages upon our trade—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And crippling it?

Secretary Root. Yes; crippling our trade. Changes are being proposed all the time all over—changes in France, changes in Germany,

changes in Brazil, changes everywhere in the tariff. Our commercial competitors are trying to get changes made that will help them and hurt us all the time. We have got to look out for it every day in the week, and somebody has got to know something about the subject.

Mr. TAWNEY. To what extent, if at all, has the Treasury Department performed this service in the past?

Secretary Root. I do not suppose to any considerable extent. It has been left to the State Department, which did not have any experts who were familiar with the subject. I have only answered a single question about trying to prevent injury. Another thing is to try to get changes made in their tariffs that will benefit us.

We have just got, incidental to a little cultivation of kindly feeling with South America, a reduction of the Brazilian duties on our flour. They gave us a 20 per cent differential, a rate 20 per cent lower to us on our flour than on the flour imported from other countries.

Mr. BURLESON. Can we obtain favors of that character without granting similar concessions?

Secretary Root. We have just done it.

Mr. BURLESON. What character of favor?

Secretary Root. A reduction of 20 per cent in the duty on flour with Brazil.

Mr. BURLESON. Without granting any concessions ourselves?

Secretary Root. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Is it not fair to say that coffee, the chief and almost sole importation of that country, Brazil, comes to this country free? That is the reason we are able to make negotiations of that kind.

Secretary Root. Of course. But an understanding of that situation—that is a simple situation—an understanding of it is necessary on our part if we are to have such a concession on their part. We have now, under the third section of the Dingley Act, authority to reduce the duties on distilled spirits, argols, and wines coming from foreign countries, for a consideration, and propositions for that are always on the tapis here. We are making such arrangements from time to time. We have got to know. Other countries are making proposals to us for reciprocity treaties, just as Germany has a proposal pending now. We can not throw a proposition of that kind out of the window.

Mr. BURLESON. I will admit the crying necessity of these experts if you are going to engage in that policy.

Secretary Root. Whatever the policy may be, we have got to engage in the policy of treating foreign countries with consideration and courtesy, and when they come to us and say, "We want to make a reciprocity treaty" and "The tariff arrangements with us are not fair," we have got to listen to them and discuss the subject with them, and we have got to have somebody who knows something about it.

Mr. BURLESON. It does not take any expert knowledge to give them a polite answer and to say that it is not the policy of the United States to do that. Is not that the situation?

Secretary Root. It is not a situation that the Secretary of State is entitled to announce. We have got to deal with each situation by itself as it occurs.

Mr. Chairman, I have had many requests from those interested in this industry for legislation of the character proposed in this amendment. I believe that it is not alone to the interest of those engaged in the manufacture of cotton-seed oil, many of whom reside in my district, but I am sure it is in the interest of every man who grows cotton.

For a number of years the cotton planter has not received what I would regard as a fair price per ton for his cotton seed. It has been thought that this might have been brought about by a common understanding or secret agreement entered into by the cotton-seed oil people, but it may be the fact that markets abroad are being closed against the cotton-seed oil that has made it impossible for the manufacturer of cotton-seed oil to pay a higher price for his raw material. If this be true, and by this small sum relief can be afforded, undoubtedly it should be allowed.

Twenty thousand dollars is all that is asked. I have tried to show you why we should have these special agents. I do not believe that our consular agents can properly serve those interested in this industry, and when I say that I do not mean it in any sense as a criticism of them. I say it in the face of the condition that confronts us, and every man here knows that it confronts us. I will not now discuss why we have not more consular agents from the South or the reasons why they are assigned to duty at obscure places. That is neither here nor there. I am not making any complaint about that at this time, but I do say if you want to do right, and accord even-handed justice, you will not deny this \$20,000 when millions are carried in the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill for the support of consular officers who look after the trade in other sections of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I will detain the House only a short time. I shall not make any extended remarks, but I simply want to say that I agree most heartily with what the gentleman from Texas has said, that this effort to widen the markets of the United States for the sale of cotton goods is not a proper subject of ridicule on the part of the gentleman from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts or any other Member. We to-day in the South are competing with Massachusetts and New England in the manufacture of cotton goods. The cotton growers of the South have also become cotton spinners.

North Carolina ranks as the third State of the Union in the manufacture of cotton goods. Massachusetts comes first, South Carolina second, and the great State of North Carolina, which I have the honor in part to represent, comes third in the manufac-

ture of cotton goods. The climate, water power, and labor in my State all unite to make the State a great manufacturing State. This amendment simply proposes, gentlemen of the House, to investigate trade conditions generally as to every article of manufacture and every product of this country sold in foreign markets. It proposes that there shall be an investigation as to trade conditions in cotton manufactures with a view to widening the markets of the United States for cotton and cotton manufactures. It appropriates \$50,000 for the employment of special agents to do this work, of which sum \$20,000 only is to be expended with a view of widening our foreign markets for cotton manufactures. I believe that would be money wisely expended, and differ wholly with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Is this sum not insignificant compared with the value of this great product of the South; this great money crop of the South? And as the gentleman from Texas has well said, there is linked with cotton and cotton manufactures also the great cotton-seed oil industry, which has grown, as I have shown in my former speech in the House, from a few hundred thousand dollars in value and investment to millions of dollars in value. We want to devise some means to get new and wider foreign markets for that great industry of the South. What was once a waste product which brought no money to the South has grown into a great industry with millions of dollars invested.

Mr. LITTAUER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Certainly.

Mr. LITTAUER. Was this waste product turned into millions of dollars of profit to the people of the South by any sort of reports of this character obtained through this appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. No. It was due to the energy of the people of the South and the fact that they possessed this raw product; but of course they get suggestions from reports and investigations as to the best markets and means of increasing the price and widening the markets for the product. I will say to the gentleman from New York as the gentleman from Texas has well said, and as I have shown in my former speeches, inasmuch as we have been unable to get reciprocity treaties we want at least to have some method or means by which we can widen the markets of the South and the United States for this cotton-seed oil product as well as our cotton manufactures. It means much to that great section of our reunited country—the Southland.

Mr. LITTAUER. Can you point to any single item in the reports already made from the expenditure of the \$30,000 for the year ending the 30th of July last or the supplemental \$50,000 that is now being expended the promotion of which is in any way attributable to that appropriation?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Well, I am not familiar with the reports, but, in a general way, I should say that the expenditure of this money—the sending of special agents abroad for the purpose of investigating trade conditions to extend the markets of the United States for all its manufactures and products, especially for cotton manufactures, throwing all possible light upon the subject—must necessarily tend to promote the widening of our markets, enabling us to know where and how to carry on our trade to the best advantage. We have been told one advantage of holding the Philippines is that they may be a base for our trade in cotton manufactures in the Orient.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I desire to put in the RECORD resolutions adopted by the Southern States Commissioners of Agriculture and Agricultural Workers sent me to-day by Doctor Kilgore, of the North Carolina department of agriculture. I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina desires to print in the RECORD the matter to which he has referred. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter above referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION.

Whereas cotton is the principal money crop of the South; that this will continue to be so for years to come is a matter about which there can be no difference of opinion. We note with a degree of great satisfaction that the United States Congress at its last session appropriated a small sum to be used in the commendable work of extending the market in foreign fields: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the Southern States Commissioners of Agriculture and Agricultural Workers, in eighth annual session convened in the city of Jacksonville, Fla., take advantage of this, the first opportunity, to express our appreciation of the recognition given our greatest crop, and heartily commend the good work undertaken for the benefit of the cotton planter and the manufacturer, and urge our southern Congressmen and Senators to use every effort to secure adequate appropriations for the active continuation of this work.

Respectfully submitted.

H. E. BLAKESLEE, *Commissioner for Mississippi*,
T. H. HUDSON, *Commissioner for Georgia*,
TAITE BUTLER, *Veterinarian for North Carolina*,
Committee.

Adopted at adjourned session held at Tampa, Fla., Wednesday, November 21, 1906.

E. J. WATSON, *President.*

Attest:

B. W. KILGORE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, my colleague [Mr. LIVINGSTON] has offered the following amendment:

For compensation, at not more than \$10 per day and actual necessary traveling expenses, of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting the foreign commerce of the United States, \$50,000, not more than \$20,000 of which shall be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products; and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress.

I had prepared to offer the same amendment, and it is in the language of the current law as contained in the appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. It has been of great benefit and valuable results have been obtained from it, and I hope it will be continued.

Under this appropriation investigations have been made by experts abroad, especially in China and other foreign countries, whose people use, to a great extent, cotton goods for clothing and other domestic purposes, and the results are contained and have been made known to us by the Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures, and they are, and will continue to be, of great benefit to our people, especially to the producers of cotton and its products. The sum proposed is so insignificant in comparison with the benefits that have been received, and will continue to be received, that it is surprising that anyone should oppose it.

The Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures, in his report, says:

WORK OF SPECIAL AGENTS.

Under the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the year 1906 the sum of \$30,000 was appropriated for an investigation of trade conditions abroad. Under this authority four special agents were appointed, one of whom was assigned to Canada, Mexico, and Cuba; one to Central and South America, and two to China and Japan. These officers not only furnished the country with valuable reports describing fully trade conditions and pointing out opportunities that invited American competition, but supplied other information of a practical character conveying object lessons to manufacturers, especially those of cotton goods, that has been productive of good results, and which has received the highest commendation from many of those whose interests were thus served. Under the appropriation act for the year 1907 the sum of \$50,000 is appropriated for continuing the investigation of trade conditions abroad, of which sum \$20,000 is provided for an inquiry into the markets for cotton products. Under this general authority investigation of foreign markets is being continued. Two experts in the manufacture of cotton goods, who were recommended very generally by manufacturers of such goods throughout the country, were appointed and have been engaged in that special work since July 1, 1906. Investigation by men trained in particular fields of activity, whose mental equipment has been supplemented by practical application, possessing in addition to these basic qualifications zeal to prosecute and ability to describe results of their investigations, can not fail to be highly valuable to the country and advantageous to the special interests that are served. Numerous letters have reached the Bureau from representative men in a number of the leading industries urging that investigation be made of markets for the promotion of their products through the agency of experts, as in the case of manufactures of cotton. It is recommended that the attention of the Congress be invited to this matter, and that provision be made for extending investigations abroad in special fields.

Referring to the markets for cotton products, he says:

EXTENT OF VALUE OF COTTON-CLOTH MARKETS.

The cotton piece-goods trade of China is one of large extent and is constantly growing. For the year 1905 the value of such cloths exported to China and Hongkong by Great Britain was \$49,625,000, a large proportion of which was composed of printed goods. For the year ended June 30, 1905, the value of cotton piece goods exported to China from the United States was \$27,761,000, out of a total exportation for the year of \$41,320,000, and for the fiscal year 1906 we sold to China \$29,641,200 of cotton cloths out of a total for the year of \$43,182,000. It will be observed that the exports of cotton cloths from Great Britain to China alone for 1905 were greater than those of the United States to all countries for that period. The figures of the cotton trade of Great Britain and the United States with South America show a much greater disparity than the figures for China. The entire value of shipments of cotton piece goods from the United States to South America for the year ended June 30, 1906, was \$3,246,567, while the shipments of Great Britain for the six months ended June 30, 1906, were valued at nearly \$18,000,000 and for the ten months ended October, 1906, at nearly \$32,000,000. To Argentina alone Great Britain in the six months ended with June, 1906, sold about \$7,000,000 worth of cotton piece goods, or twice as much as the United States sold for the entire fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, to all the countries of South America.

There seems to be no reason why the United States should not dispose of a large quantity of cotton printed goods and increase the sale of plain goods in the Orient, and reports of all observers agree that this can be done if our manufacturers will consult the conditions of the market, the requirements of the trade, the methods of doing business, and the tastes and desires of the people, and adjust their business to those conditions. The samples of printed goods sent by the special agents of the Department from China, accompanied by elaborate descriptions and explanations, were a revelation to our manufacturers and clearly established that these goods can be produced in the United States and sold in China in successful competition with those of European manufacturers.

The special agents of the Department of Commerce and Labor appointed to carry out the provisions of the present law, for which this appropriation was made by Congress, in a report which has been published, and which I have, show that there

is a growing demand for cotton and cotton goods in both north and south China, and that the American manufacturer can find an increasing market there, provided he can be informed in a well-defined way of the needs of the market. Not only is the foreign trade in cotton and cotton manufactures of great importance, but the cotton-seed industry and the products of cotton seed, most of which in former years was thrown away, have become one of the greatest industries in the country, especially in the South, where cotton is raised, until now products of the value of \$100,000,000 a year are produced from cotton seed, of which thirty million and odd dollars was exported this year, increasing from \$13,000,000 in 1897 to \$31,000,000 and over in 1906.

It may well be said that the cotton industry—the production of raw cotton and the manufactured products from the raw material and other by-products—is not only the greatest and most valuable industry in the United States, but in the world. This statement can not be answered by ridicule or comparison of the great staple product of the South, which produces this great wealth for the country and the world, with other insignificant products of the United States, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN] has undertaken to do. Two-thirds of the raw material of cotton raised by the Southern States, which is the cotton-producing country of the world, is exported, to be converted by England, Germany, France, and other nations, into manufactured goods for the clothing of the world. But more than that, this great staple crop of the South has brought into the United States untold millions of foreign gold, and through it has not only made the South prosperous, but the entire country. In 1905 the value of raw cotton exported and the by-products of cotton, other than goods manufactured from cotton, brought into the United States \$380,000,000 of the \$400,000,000 of excess of exports over imports for that year. This great staple agricultural product of the South produces annually all of this excess except about \$20,000,000. In five years the cotton crop and its by-products from seed amounted in value to \$2,974,000,000, which was \$400,000,000 more than the entire output of gold and silver of the world for those years. So that this small sum asked for by this amendment is to be expended not simply to aid the farmers and manufacturers of the South, but to aid the entire United States, which but for this great staple product of our farms would not to-day enjoy the prosperity that it does.

Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the reports, not those made by one of our consular agents, but of the special agents appointed under the appropriation made last year to make these investigations, and I hold in my hand the summarized report of the Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures upon that subject, from which I have quoted. We are informed of the competition we are to meet and how we are to meet it. These investigations have been made both in northern and southern China and India and South America. The people of the South who are engaged in producing this great wealth of our country have outstripped our brethren of the North in the manufacture of cotton goods, because, from manufacturing only a small portion thirty years ago, we now manufacture more raw cotton in the South than in the Northern or Eastern States. And for this great staple product of ours, which is turned into cloth for the clothing of the world, we simply ask that the small sum of \$20,000 shall be appropriated in order that we may be informed where this trade can best be found and the conditions existing, so we can compete with the world.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] asked the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS] if there was any proof or any statement that these investigations had been of any benefit. I have in my possession a telegram signed by many manufacturers of cotton-seed oil in my district, and they have appealed to me asking me to see that this appropriation shall be had, because it has been of inestimable benefit to them and to the manufacturers of cotton-seed oil. I make this statement on information furnished by gentlemen who are engaged in the manufacture of at least \$100,000,000 worth of this product a year.

Mr. Chairman, this product, the cotton of the South, not only brings wealth to the South, as it has done, but it has brought wealth to the entire people of the United States. For more than three or four years the value of the product has increased from \$540,000,000 until the product this year will amount to \$650,000,000 and more, not for the manufactured product, but for the raw material. No other product of this country can compare with it except the great corn crop.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like just a minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BART-

LETT] asks unanimous consent to continue his remarks for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Chairman, I started to say this great crop of ours is greater in value than all of the other crops of the country except corn, and the most remarkable thing is that with that crop, amounting to \$650,000,000 a year, the raw material is not consumed at home like that other great agricultural product which exceeds it in value, but two-thirds of it is shipped and brings into this country every year hundreds of millions of dollars of foreign gold to create and increase our prosperity, not simply of its producers, but of the entire country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. SULLIVAN].

The question was taken; and the substitute was rejected.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] offers a substitute, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation and actual necessary traveling expenses of special agents to investigate trade conditions abroad, with the object of promoting foreign commerce of the United States, \$30,000, and the results of such investigation shall be reported to Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the provision I have offered and the provision offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] is that, in the first place, it eliminates the specific compensation to be paid to a special agent. I believe the gentleman's provision calls for compensation at the rate of \$10 a day, and, secondly, my substitute omits the words "twenty thousand dollars" as the specified sum to be used in the investigation of markets for cotton products, and, further, I propose to reduce the total amount appropriated from \$50,000 to \$30,000. I am in complete sympathy with the end that is sought to be attained with this appropriation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Then, Mr. Chairman, why does the gentleman cut out cotton, when he knows—

Mr. LITTAUER. If the gentleman will give me but two minutes I will try and explain my position. I want to develop the commerce of the United States in every possible way. I am a manufacturer, even a manufacturer of cotton goods. I have read these reports one after the other, for I have been on the Appropriation Committee which has suggested to the House this legislation from its origin. We submitted it originally through the urgent appeals of the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, to the effect that if he could but have a sum so as to send agents into one country and another, he could report to Congress facts that would enable our manufacturers to extend their trade in a very large way. The result of that first \$30,000 of expenditure was that a professor of the faculty of the University of California was appointed one of the agents. He visited the countries of South and Central America with two other agents. One of them, I believe, was assistant commissioner at the Paris Exposition, and I believe the other one a newspaper writer, who visited various countries, and sent us back these reports, which gentlemen can obtain and read.

Now, gentlemen, you can not develop the trade of the United States by statistics; you can not develop the trade of the United States by having a newspaper writer send you an attractive description of various conditions of any particular trade in a country, neither can you do it by gathering from guidebooks and trade journals certain peculiarities of trade. If you want to develop the trade of the United States in any particular way, send some competent manufacturer abroad; keep him abroad long enough that he can go into the details of production and distribution that will enable the home manufacturer to understand in detail what he must do to compete with his competitors in that market. I do not believe that the expenditure of the \$80,000 already appropriated will ever bring back \$80,000 to the United States. We are all intensely interested in the cotton industry and hope to see it extended year after year, as it has in the last half dozen years begun to be extended in the South, until it conquers a large part of the trade of manufactured cotton goods throughout the world. But you can not do it in this way; you can not do it by attractive reports of newspaper men sent around the world. Nor can you aid the cotton-seed people to find a market in this way. If the cotton-seed oil industry, trust or otherwise, wants to extend its trade, it has competent men, who thoroughly

understand the details of that business; and if this country does not furnish a large enough market for their oil they will send men throughout the world and use every shrewd business method to extend their trade, and they will get results that will inure to their profit.

Now, the appropriation last year as it passed the House was amended by an addition of \$20,000 to be specially devoted to cotton. I know nothing about whether it has resulted in any good or not. This year we have been appealed to by various manufacturers, by manufacturers of machines and machine tools, by boot and shoe manufacturers, and by many other trades to extend specifically appropriation to cover their particular articles. By the way, there is a report on the boot and shoe trade in England. I do not believe that report is worth—I was going to say 10 cents. I do not believe there is a fact in it—and I personally deal with leather and leather goods, so that I know something about it—that will ever enable an extra pair of shoes to be sent out of the country or keep a man in this country a day longer at work. I believe that this entire appropriation will lead to no good result. There is a great deal of sentiment connected with the question, and a great deal of sentiment connected with the \$20,000 with respect to cotton goods. When the United States will no longer provide the best, most profitable, and most ample market for our manufactures, the energetic, enterprising manufacturers of our country will themselves find the way to extend their trade and conquer the markets of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the substitute amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the chairman announced that he was in doubt.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 88, noes 70.

Mr. HEFLIN. Tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LITTAUER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON] will take their places as tellers.

The committee again divided; and tellers reported—ayes 86, noes 77.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The question was taken; and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. BINGHAM. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose, and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. HEPBURN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 21574, and had come to no resolution thereon.

STANDARD OF ORTHOGRAPHY.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following House resolution, and I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following House resolution, and also that the report thereon be printed in the RECORD.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 663.

Resolved That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that hereafter, in printing reports, documents, or other publications authorized by law, ordered by Congress or either branch thereof, or emanating from the Executive Departments, their bureaus or branches, and independent offices of the Government, the Government Printing Office should observe and adhere to the standard of orthography prescribed in generally accepted dictionaries of the English language.

The report is as follows:

In reporting favorably the accompanying resolution the Committee on Printing has been governed by the following considerations:

In the various reprints of the Constitution of the United States adherence to the original spelling is found in the majority of instances.

The spelling in the original statutes reflects the forms of spelling in vogue at the time of their enactment.

The various codifications of the statutes reflect the spelling in vogue at the time of the adoption of such codifications.

The last codification adopted was in 1878. The Statutes at Large now number fourteen volumes, covering a period of twenty-eight years. Each volume reflects the spelling in vogue at the time of the enactment of the statutes embraced therein.

A new codification is about to be presented to Congress. Until Congress shall see fit to order the printing of this proposed codification of the statutes, embracing all the enactments of the law-making power of the Government now in force, in some form of spelling other than that generally accepted by the people, it would appear to be the part of wisdom for the Government in all its branches, in the interest of simplicity and economy, to adhere to a uniform system of spelling, and this sys-

tem should be the one already most generally recognized and accepted by the people.

If Congress shall adhere to the form of spelling already in vogue as applied to the statutes, it would appear anomalous to employ some other form as applied to all of the preliminary stages of legislation, including the proceedings of Congress, up to the point where these proceedings are crystallized into law, and at this point order a change in the spelling of the perfected legislation to preserve harmony in the orthography of the national statutes.

The Executive order under which many public documents have already been printed was issued on the 27th day of August, 1906, and has now been in force for more than three months. It has been extensively exploited, and the public has had ample opportunity to digest the arguments presented in its favor.

Without taking issue as to the relative merits of any form of spelling, it is evident that public sentiment as reflected in the newspapers, magazines, and other publications has not been favorable to the proposed innovation embraced in the Executive order of August 27.

It is, therefore, a condition and not a theory with which Congress has to deal. It is not believed that the attitude of the general public would be materially changed if the Government in all its branches were to adopt the form of spelling prescribed in the Executive order referred to, and only confusion and expense would result without any commensurate advantage, even if the new form of spelling were deemed preferable. Moreover, Congress has no assurance, even if it should leave present conditions undisturbed, that the next succeeding Administration would not revoke the present order. Much of the matter embraced in the publications of the Government is preserved in the form of stereotyped or electrotyped plates, representing enormous values to the Government in the saving of labor and other expense. All of these plates would be rendered worthless in a moment by an order in a succeeding Administration revoking the Executive order of August 27 last.

The sentiment in Congress is such that it must be taken without question that in the printing done for Congress the standard dictionaries will continue to be the accepted authority. If some other form of spelling is to apply to the Executive Departments, it means a dual form of spelling in the Government printing.

Much of the printing that is done for Congress is reproduced in executive documents. Much of the printing that is done for the Executive Departments is reproduced in Congressional publications. If the Government is to have two forms of spelling, this will necessarily mean double composition, double stereotyping and electrotyping, double proof reading, and other incidental expense. It will mean a double force of proof readers, for it is inconceivable that a proof reader could be required to adapt himself to more than one system of spelling with the expectation of rendering efficient service.

In justice to Government officials, it may be said, an order which dictates a particular form of orthography, involving a departure from the recognized standard in popular use, imposes upon the head of an Executive Department, as well as upon all of his subordinates, a policy that may well be considered in many instances offensive.

In the opinion of the committee, any departure from the recognized standards of orthography can not with safety, satisfaction, or economy be taken until Congress and the Executive shall agree upon the adoption of other orthographic methods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the gentleman yield to me a minute?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will.

Mr. GILLETT. I want to say one word, because if this resolution goes through by unanimous consent without explanation it might look as if everybody who believed in the simplified spelling had changed his mind overnight. While I am perfectly content with this resolution, it is not because I have in the slightest changed my opinion; but I recognized yesterday that this House prefers the spelling now approved by the standard dictionaries. I believe it is very proper and economical that all Government documents should follow the same system of spelling. I do not believe some of us should have our speeches printed in one system and others in another, or that the Executive documents should be printed in one form and the documents of the House of Representatives in another. I should prefer that all documents should be printed with the new spelling, but inasmuch as they should all be uniform, and I am obviously in the minority, I bow to the will of the majority and approve the adoption of this resolution.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I referred to the origin of the law identifying or pointing out the English language as the language of England, from which, as I claim, we inherit the language that we have in this country.

I now ask unanimous consent to extend these remarks in the RECORD, to the extent of publishing the law under which the official language of the people of England was changed from the Norman-French to the English of to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio to extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The statute in question was passed in 1362, in the reign of King Edward III, and is as follows:

CAP. XV.—Pleas shall be pleaded in the English tongue, and inrolled in Latin.

Item, because it is often showed to the King by the prelates, dukes, earls, barons, and all the commonalty of the great mischiefs which have happened to divers of the realm, because the laws, customs, and statutes of this realm be not commonly holden and kept in the same realm, for that they be pleaded, shewed, and judged in the French tongue, which is much unknown in the said realm, so that the people which do implead, or be impleaded, in the King's court, and in the courts of other, have no knowledge nor understanding of that which is said for them or against them by their serjeants and other pleaders; (2) and that

reasonably the said laws and customs the rather shall be perceived and known, and better understood in the tongue used in the said realm, and by so much every man of the said realm may the better govern himself without offending of the law, and the better keep, save, and defend his heritage and possessions; (3) and in divers regions and countries, where the King, the nobles, and other of the said realm have been, good governance and full right is done to every person, because that their laws and customs be learned and used in the tongue of the country; (4) the King, desiring the good governance and tranquillity of his people, and to put out and eschew the harms and mischiefs which do or may happen in this behalf by the occasions aforesaid, hath ordained and established by the assent aforesaid, that all pleas which shall be pleaded in any courts whatsoever, before any of his justices whatsoever, or in his other places, or before any of his other ministers whatsoever, or in the courts and places of any other lords whatsoever within the realm, shall be pleaded, shewed, defended, answered, debated, and judged in the English tongue and that they be entered and enrolled in Latin; (5) and that the laws and customs of the same realm, terms, and processes, be holden and kept as they be and have been before this time; (6) and that by the ancient terms and forms of the declarations no man be prejudiced, so that the matter of the action be fully shewed in the declaration and in the writ. (7) And it is accorded by the assent aforesaid that this ordinance and statute of pleading begin and hold place at the fifteenth of St. Hillary next coming.

Thus it will be seen that the English language became ours first, by the statute itself here cited, and second, by our inheritance. While it may be true that we do not in terms in the United States adopt the common law of England in all our matters of legislation, it is equally true that the pioneers who came to Jamestown believed that they brought with them the common law of England as their guide, and for all these years since the reign of Edward III, more than five hundred years, the English language as specified in the dictionaries of the language has been the true language of the English speaking people. It would seem, therefore, that the standards which have built up the language are the proper guides to the present condition, and that the changes must come more gradually, as they have been coming, and which will no doubt in the long run continue to modify the orthography of the language to a full and satisfactory result.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire the privilege of extending my remarks on the amendment to the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask the same privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the same request. Is there objection to either request?

Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina. I also make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. THOMAS] also makes the same request. Is there objection? There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 6855. An act to amend the act approved August 19, 1890, entitled "An act to adopt regulations for preventing collisions at sea"—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

RESIGNATION OF REPRESENTATIVE PATTERSON, OF TENNESSEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

COMMITTEE ON INSULAR AFFAIRS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 13, 1906.

To the SPEAKER:

I herewith tender my resignation as a Member of the Fifty-ninth Congress, to take effect on the 15th day of January, 1907.

I have the honor to inclose a copy of a letter addressed to the Hon. John I. Cox, governor of Tennessee, notifying him of my said resignation.

I have the honor to be, respectfully,

M. R. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Tenth District Tennessee.

DECEMBER 13, 1906.

His Excellency JOHN I. COX,
Governor of Tennessee.

SIR: I have the honor to notify you that I have this day tendered my resignation as a Member of the Fifty-ninth Congress to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, said resignation to take effect January 15, 1907.

A copy of said resignation is herein inclosed.

I have the honor to be, respectfully,

M. R. PATTERSON,
Member of Congress, Tenth District Tennessee.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, this communication will lie on the table.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a memorial of the Chickasaw legislature in reference to sale of coal and asphalt lands—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for dredging and piers at Jamestown Exposition—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, requesting attention to the accumulation of useless papers in his Department—to the Joint Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Labor, submitting an estimate of appropriation for a site for a house and an outbuilding at Duluth (Minn.) range light station—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting an estimate of appropriations for rent of additional quarters for the Auditor for the Navy Department—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, recommending legislation to regulate the compensation of the superintendent of the national cemetery at Arlington—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, submitting a detailed statement of the expenses of the Revenue-Cutter Service for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for construction and maintenance of military and post roads, bridges, and trails in Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of urgent appropriation for pay of the Military Academy—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of the International Water Boundary Commission—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for expenses of hearings on land entries and of depositing public moneys—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a report of disbursements for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1906, for colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts in the several States and Territories—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a copy of a memorial of the Chickasaw legislature relative to public highways in the nation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a memorial of the Chickasaw legislature protesting against the enrollment of certain children, and transmitting an opinion of the Assistant Attorney-General in the case of Ethel Pierson—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, submitting papers relating to the claim of Gutierrez Hermanos—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting, in accordance with the act of June 29, 1906, certain documents pertaining to the construction of a new vessel for the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for contingent expenses of the Territorial legislature of New Mexico—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9250) granting an increase of pension to Obediah B. Nation, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5423); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14862) granting an increase of pension to Ann E. White, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5424); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16249) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Miller, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5425); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16389) granting a pension to Jefferson Wilcox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5426); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16488) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hopkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5427); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 16546) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Beeler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5428); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18608) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Strickland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5429); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DICKSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18677) granting a pension to Martin A. Luther, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5430); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18758) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Daniel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5431); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LONGWORTH, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18791) granting a pension to Michael Bocosey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5432); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19363) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Bland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5433); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19510) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. West, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5434); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19577) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Patton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5435); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19579) granting an increase of pension to Robert Mayfield, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5436); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19648) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Wilson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5437); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19713) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Mason, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5438); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19715) granting an increase of pension to Susan M. Brunson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5439); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19716) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Johnson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5440); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19722) granting an increase of pension to William H. Burns, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5441); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19818) granting an increase of pension to William F. Clinkscales, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5442); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BENNETT of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19907) granting an increase of pension to James Butler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5443); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19923) granting an increase of pension to Bettie Ferguson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5444); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 19998) granting an increase of pension to Eunice Cook, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5445); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20087) granting an increase of pension to Cassia C. Tyler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5446); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20088) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Thurmond, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5447); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20146) granting an increase of pension to Harriet C. Kenney, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5448); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20166) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Salmon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5449); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20198) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Maddox, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5450); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20219) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Downing, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5451); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20250) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McBride, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5452); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20269) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Galloway, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5453); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MACON, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20357) granting an increase of pension to Jane Aldridge, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5454); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20363) granting an increase of pension to Otis E. Rnsh, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5455); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20391) granting an increase of pension to Mary Jane Meldrim, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5456); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 20424) granting an increase of pension to George W. Wheeler, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5457); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21142) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rose, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5458); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21216) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. McCardel, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5459); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21578) granting an increase of pension to A. J. Gashey, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5460); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7211) granting a pension to James C. Southerland, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5461); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18582) granting a pension to Josephine Hoffman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 5462); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GARNER: A bill (H. R. 22332) to construct a canal from Rio Grande to Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DRESSER: A bill (H. R. 22333) to provide for the erection of a public building at Bradford, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 22334) to amend an act to regulate the sitting of the United States courts within the district of South Carolina—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 22335) to amend section 2 of the act of June 27, 1890, entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 22336) for the better protection of depositors and creditors of national banks—to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRONNA: A bill (H. R. 22337) to increase the compensation of rural mail carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RANDELL of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 22338) to bridge Bayou Bartholomew, in Louisiana—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22339) appropriating \$250,000 to eradicate the Texas fever tick—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATKINS: A bill (H. R. 22340) to provide for a survey of Sabine River, in Louisiana and Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 22341) making an appropriation toward the construction of a dry dock at the Portsmouth Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 22342) for the erection of a public building at Hopkinsville, Ky.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 22343) to provide for the erection of a District of Columbia building and an appropriate exhibit therein at the Jamestown Ter-Centennial Exposition, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 22344) to provide for the erection of a public building at Hickory, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22345) to provide for the erection of a public building at Gastonia, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 22346) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell the lands in Mays Gulf of Little River, Alabama—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BROOKS of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 22347) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, approved April 26, 1906"—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PAGE: A bill (H. R. 22348) authorizing a public building at Monroe, N. C.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOUSTON: A bill (H. R. 22349) to increase the amount fixed as the limit of cost of site and building at Murfreesboro, Tenn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HULL: A bill (H. R. 22350) to authorize the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia to recopy old records in his office, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 22351) to survey and allot the lands embraced within the limits of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, in the State of Montana, and to open the surplus lands to settlement—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KLINE: A bill (H. R. 22352) to amend sections 2 and 3 of an act approved May 9, 1900, in amendment of sections 2 and 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 22353) establishing a minimum rate of pensions for soldiers of the civil war—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 22354) to provide for the improvement of Broad Creek River, Delaware—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RIVES: A bill (H. R. 22355) to provide for the erection of a public building at Litchfield, Ill.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 22356) to remove restrictions on the sale of certain lands in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 204) disapproving certain laws enacted by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. HAYES: A resolution (H. Res. 660) requesting certain information of the Secretary of War concerning the Chinese and Japanese coolies now employed on the Panama Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WACHTER: A resolution (H. Res. 661) authorizing the chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills to appoint an additional clerk—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A resolution (H. Res. 662) concerning the pay of employees of the folding room—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 22357) granting an increase of pension to Silas Chase—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22358) granting an increase of pension to Oliver D. Pearson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 22359) grant-

ing an increase of pension to Louisa L. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: A bill (H. R. 22360) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Bean—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. BRICK: A bill (H. R. 22361) granting an increase of pension to George W. Favorite—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 22362) making an appropriation to pay Esther Rousseau for horses killed upon the Cheyenne Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22363) granting an honorable discharge to Alfred L. Dutton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 22364) granting a pension to James F. Humphrey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22365) granting a pension to Charles B. Fessenden, jr.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22366) for the relief of Adam R. Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22367) for the relief of Patrick Conlin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22368) for the relief of Alonzo Rich—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22369) for the relief of James B. Callison—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22370) for the relief of Daniel Sands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 22371) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Hickman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 22372) granting an increase of pension to James C. Corder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22373) granting an increase of pension to Willis Hargrave—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22374) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Elam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22375) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Halcomb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CONNER: A bill (H. R. 22376) granting a pension to William M. Colby—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22377) granting a pension to Robert R. Montgomery—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COUSINS: A bill (H. R. 22378) granting an increase of pension to Lidia A. Patterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 22379) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George F. Harter—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 22380) granting a pension to Sylvester S. Ingals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22381) granting a pension to William H. Belknap—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22382) granting a pension to Josie I. Blair—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22383) granting an increase of pension to Frederick R. Wright—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22384) granting an increase of pension to William S. Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22385) granting an increase of pension to James S. Brackett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22386) granting an increase of pension to William H. Tripp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22387) granting an increase of pension to William Warren—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22388) granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Peabody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22389) granting an increase of pension to Harriett M. Stevens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22390) granting an increase of pension to Helen R. Worcester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22391) granting an increase of pension to David Y. Kenion—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22392) granting an increase of pension to Eugene W. Rolfe—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22393) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 22394) granting an increase of pension to M. V. Easterday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22395) granting a pension to Edward Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 22396) granting an increase of pension to William L. Alvey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22397) granting an increase of pension to Francis B. C. Rall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22398) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca J. Forry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22399) granting an increase of pension to William Sauvain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22400) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin S. Lester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DIXON of Montana: A bill (H. R. 22401) to provide compensation to Daniel Yancey for buildings constructed by him in the Yellowstone National Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 22402) granting an honorable discharge to Alfred Childers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FLOYD: A bill (H. R. 22403) granting a pension to Pleasant H. Farmer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22404) granting a pension to William Lay—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22405) granting an increase of pension to Horatio M. McGoughy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 22406) granting an increase of pension to Ignatious Lentenbacher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22407) granting an increase of pension to Henry Peacock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 22408) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARRETT: A bill (H. R. 22409) granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. McAdoo—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GILHAMS: A bill (H. R. 22410) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Roberts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22411) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Yeakey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 22412) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Hubbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22413) to remove the charge of desertion against Samuel S. Caldwell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 22414) granting an increase of pension to Buckhardt Schoenstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22415) granting an increase of pension to T. W. David—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 22416) granting an increase of pension to Barbara E. Schwab—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 22417) granting an increase of pension to David B. Willard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: A bill (H. R. 22418) granting an increase of pension to Timothy Ford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22419) granting an increase of pension to Elizur F. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILL of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 22420) granting an increase of pension to Edward Wesley Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HINSHAW: A bill (H. R. 22421) granting an increase of pension to D. H. Moredick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: A bill (H. R. 22422) granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22423) granting an increase of pension to Louis Miller—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUNT: A bill (H. R. 22424) granting an increase of pension to William Faulkner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 22425) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sires—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 22426) granting an increase of pension to Louisa A. Robertson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 22427) granting an increase of pension to Edwin W. Braman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22428) granting a pension to Dora T. Bristol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LILLEY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22429) granting a pension to George R. Woodruff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONGWORTH: A bill (H. R. 22430) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo C. Horton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLAY of California: A bill (H. R. 22431) granting an increase of pension to Alden Youngman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MADDEN: A bill (H. R. 22432) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Matteson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 22433) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 22434) granting an increase of pension to Peter McCormick—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22435) granting an increase of pension to Knud R. Syverald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEVIN: A bill (H. R. 22436) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22437) granting an increase of pension to Louis A. Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22438) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Beck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 22439) granting an increase of pension to Martin N. Briggs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEARRE: A bill (H. R. 22440) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Mose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22441) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POLLARD: A bill (H. R. 22442) granting an increase of pension to John Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A bill (H. R. 22443) granting an increase of pension to Lyman S. Strickland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 22444) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 22445) granting a pension to Adaline T. Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22446) granting a pension to William F. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22447) granting an increase of pension to Frank Schadler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 22448) granting a pension to F. Medora Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of California: A bill (H. R. 22449) granting a pension to Charles L. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 22450) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Brewer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 22451) granting an increase of pension to John McCaslin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22452) granting an increase of pension to William A. Narrin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 22453) granting an increase of pension to William Swendeman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22454) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Darst—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22455) granting a pension to Louisa Filley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 22456) granting a pension to Ella Fall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 22457) granting an increase of pension to Julia Churchill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22458) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Redding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 22459) granting an increase of pension to James Tetlow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22460) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Bower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22461) granting a pension to George A. De Voe—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 22462) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Chamberlain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TRIMBLE: A bill (H. R. 22463) granting a pension to Virgil H. Parks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22464) granting a pension to Berthina Cold—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22465) granting an increase of pension to George Hoffer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22466) granting an increase of pension to Walter Florida—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS: A bill (H. R. 22467) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 22468) granting an increase of pension to William Kelso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 22469) granting an increase of pension to William S. Mooney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 22470) granting an increase of pension to Flavius J. Ruley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14998) for the relief of John Shuffelbarger—Committee on War Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 21701) for the relief of Joseph V. Cunningham and other officers of the Philippine Volunteers—Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 22073) granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Scott—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22084) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Jenkins—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 22095) granting an increase of pension to William C. Montgomery—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of Lodge No. 178 of the Bakery and Confectionery Workers of America and other labor organizations, favoring the Merchant Marine Commission shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. AIKEN: Petition of Greenwood Council, No. 19, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Eliza O. Calvard—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of C. Tussing, of Tonawanda, N. Y., against section 1, subsection 9, of the copyright bill, relative to the feature against mechanical musical instruments—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: Papers to accompany bills for relief of John Hand, Isaac N. Bliss, and William J. Turpin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the Spanish-American Memorial Association, for an appropriation to erect at Washington, D. C., an appropriate memorial of the Spanish war—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of national committee of the Spanish War Veterans, for restoration of the Army canteen at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of Macon Council, No. 9, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William O. Phillips—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Benjamin James—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Louisa L. Wood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: Resolutions of sundry labor organizations, favoring postal savings banks, as follows: Kalamazoo (Mich.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 208; Muskegon (Mich.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 24; Sault Ste. Marie (Mich.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 19; Detroit (Mich.) Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paper Hangers; Biddeford (Me.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 40; Paterson (N. J.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 3; Binghamton (N. Y.) Cigar Makers' Unions, Nos. 218 and 16; New York City Cigar Makers' Union, No. 141; Gloversville (N. Y.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 483; Philadelphia (Pa.) Bakers' Local Union No. 6; Davenport (Iowa) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 172; Muscatine (Iowa) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 120; Marysville (Kans.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 163; Louisville (Ky.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 32; St. Louis (Mo.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 44; Minneapolis (Minn.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 77; Memphis (Tenn.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 266; Norfolk (Va.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 240; Aberdeen (Wash.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 109; Canton (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 297; Elgin (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 71; Monmouth (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 305; Peoria (Ill.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 118; Cincinnati (Ohio) Steam Fitters and Helpers' Union, No. 53; Cincinnati (Ohio) Central Labor Council; Cincinnati (Ohio) Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, No. 15; Cincinnati (Ohio) Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, No. 222; Canton (Ohio) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 115; Columbus (Ohio) Protective Union, No. 75; Springfield (Ohio) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 45; Eau Claire (Wis.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 85; Manitowoc (Wis.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 477; Milwaukee (Wis.) Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, No. 15; Watertown (Wis.) Cigar Makers' Union, No. 381; also the following, all of Chicago: Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Union; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, No. 260; Amalgamated Glassworkers' International Association, Local No. 1; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 5; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 7; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 44; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 75; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 17; Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees, No. 266; Horse Nail Makers' Union No. 7180; International Association of Bridge and Structural Ironworkers, No. 1; International Association of Machinists, Progressive Lodge, No. 126; International Association of Machinists, Tool and Die Makers, Lodge No. 510; International Association of Machinists, Unity Lodge, No. 134; International Association of Machinists, Reliable Lodge, No. 253; International Association of Machinists, Brassworkers' Lodge, No. 766; International Association of Steam, Hot Water, and Power Pipe Fitters, No. 54; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths and Helpers, No. 324; International Union of Steam Engineers, No. 115; Independent Wood Carvers' Association of North America; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, No. 12; International Brotherhood of Teamsters, No. 721; International Longshoremen, Marine and Transportation Workers, No. 361; International Union of Elevator Constructors, No. 2; Journeymen Horseshoers' Local Union No. 4; Journeymen Tailors' Union No. 5; Metal Polishers, Buffers, and Platers' Union No. 6; Lithographers' International Protective and Benevolent Association, Local Union No. 70; National Stonecutters' Society of the United States; Plasterers' Local Union No. 5; Plumbers' Union No. 189; Photo-Engravers' Union No. 5; Sprinkler Fitters' Union No. 281; Shipwrights, Joiners, and Caulkers' International Union, No. 17; Switchmen's Union, Chicago Lodge, No. 199; Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance, No. 115; Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' Union; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees; Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees, No. 260; Amalgamated Glassworkers' International Association, Local No. 1; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 5; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 7; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 44; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 75; Amalgamated Woodworkers' Local Union No. 17; Amalgamated Association of Street Railway Employees, Division No. 266; Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union No. 62; Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 1; Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 141; Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 181; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Chicago Division, No. 96; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Mount Pleasant Division, No. 429; Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, John Player Division, No. 458; Butchers and Grocery Clerks' Association, No. 3; Boiler Makers and Iron-Ship Builders and Helpers, No. 39; Brotherhood of Engravers,

No. 1; Chicago Trades Union Label League; Cigar Packers' International Union, Local No. 227; Coopers' International Union, No. 1; Carriage and Cab Drivers' Union No. 17; Elevated Railway Employees' Union, Division No. 308; Glove Workers' Union, No. 18—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BURKETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Patrick Conlin, James F. Humphries, and Charles B. Fessenden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of Alonzo Rich and Daniel Sands—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Adam R. Hartzell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRADLEY: Petition of the Newburgh News Publishing Company, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DALZELL: Petitions of Hazel Glen Council, No. 208, and Laurel Council, No. 126, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DAWSON: Petition of Union No. 299, Amalgamated Sheet Metal Workers' International Alliance, of Davenport, Iowa, for the subsidy shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DOVENER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Will P. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of Central City Council, No. 52, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Alfred Childress—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Lincoln Council, No. 14, and McKinley Council, No. 81, Junior Order United American Mechanics, for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLETCHER: Petition of Coopers' Machine Operators, No. 75, of Minneapolis, Minn., for the subsidy shipping bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FLOYD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John W. Hudson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Arkansas, for an appropriation to make the waters of White River available for electric-power purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Pearson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORDNEY: Petition of Saginaw Reading Club, for free-art legislation, as per bill H. R. 15268—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GARRETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Margaret A. McAdoo—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GOEBEL: Petitions of Bethlehem Council, No. 79, of Cincinnati, Ohio; Queen City Council, and Victory Council, No. 180, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Phoenix Council, No. 58, and Concord Council, No. 134, Daughters of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403) to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Vesuvius Council, No. 116, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of Sharpsburg, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of William W. Tyson and Edward Hadfield—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Lady Unity Council, No. 51, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of Pride of Bridgeport Council, No. 3, Daughters of America, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOLLIDAY: Petitions of Old Glory Council, No. 18, Daughters of America, of Terre Haute, Ind., and Lipord Council, No. 70, and Lincoln Council, No. 56, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HUFF: Petitions of Bolivar Council, No. 570, and Paintersville Council, No. 211, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of New Stanton, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN: Paper to accompany bill

for relief of Charles E. Pratt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KNAPP: Resolutions of Pomona Grange, Jefferson County, N. Y., for reduction of duties on Philippine products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Petition of the Fruit Growers' Association of Adams County, Pa., for legislation to secure admission of American fruit to German markets at minimum duties—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Federation of Trades Unions of York, Pa., for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew Rickrods—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Ella K. Wolf—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Annie K. Slothower—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Louis N. Brady—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of John Roth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: Petition of the Telegram, Holyoke, Mass., against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE: Petition of Mary E. Rainey, heir of Thomas R. Couche, deceased, praying for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edwin W. Brayman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Dora T. Bristol—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William Marvin et al., for an appropriation to open, widen, and deepen the channel of Eightmile River, in Lyme, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary S. Houghtaling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINNEY: Petition of the Business Men's Association and the city council of Rock Island, Ill., for an appropriation to improve the upper Mississippi River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew J. Moore, of Hamilton County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OLMSTED: Petitions of Annville Council, No. 954; Swatara (Middletown, Pa.) Council, No. 858, and Steelton Council, No. 162, Junior Order United American Mechanics; Silver Star Council (Harrisburg, Pa.), No. 130, and Lincoln Council (Carlisle, Pa.), No. 117, Daughters of Liberty, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of Milwaukee Division, No. 46, Railway Conductors of America, for the ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RANSDELL of Louisiana: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Aurela Robillard, and of H. P. Morancy, administrator of estate of Zachary White—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIXEY: Papers to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Philip Houser and heirs of Daniel Ruggles—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Frank Schadler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William F. Myers—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of the Cattle Raisers' Association, praying Congress to require the railways to furnish sufficient cars to ship live stock to market—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STERLING: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Isaac L. Stine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bills for relief of John S. Bray, Joseph W. King, James D. Cox, and Richard H. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN WINKLE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Maria Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Kelso—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALLACE: Petition of J. H. Parkhurst et al., for an appropriation to reimburse said petitioners for over daily hours of work on Georgetown pumping station from May 1, 1871, to December, 1890—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Lansdale Council, No. 111,

Daughters of Liberty, of Lansdale, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. WEBB: Papers to accompany bills for relief of Mary C. Jones, Mary Ann Cody, Margaret L. James, Susan Baker, Mary Levina Williams, and Isabel Manney—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of the Somerset (N. J.) Democrat, against tariff on linotype machines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, December 14, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SPERRY, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, papers in the case of William C. Manning (H. R. 1857, Fifty-eighth Congress), no adverse report having been made thereon.

PENSION DAY.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar in order to-day shall be in order to-morrow immediately after the approval of the Journal. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL BILL.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 21574, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. HERBURN in the chair.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

SEC. 2. The pay of telephone switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, watchmen, laborers, and charwomen provided for in this act, except those employed in mints and assay offices, unless otherwise specially stated, shall be as follows: For telephone switchboard operators, assistant messengers, firemen, and watchmen, at the rate of \$720 per annum each; for laborers, at the rate of \$600 per annum each; assistant telephone switchboard operators, at the rate of \$600 each, and for charwomen, at the rate of \$240 per annum each.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order to section 2 in order to make an inquiry. Does this section increase or decrease the compensation of these employees, or simply classify them?

Mr. BINGHAM. It does not in any way increase or decrease the compensation, but it is for the purpose of preventing the continual repetition throughout the bill.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. Only such books, periodicals, and pamphlets shall be purchased out of any appropriation made in this or any other act for the use of any library or office or officer as are strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, Bureau, office, or officer authorized to use such library or collection of books; and all books, periodicals, and pamphlets which now form a part of or belong to any library or office collection of books and which are not strictly essential to the technical and professional work of the particular Department, Bureau, or office shall be transferred on or before January 1, 1908, to the Library of Congress, except that books of fiction and belles lettres shall be transferred to the Free Public Library of the District of Columbia, and all expenses of making this transfer, not otherwise sufficiently provided for, shall be paid from appropriations made for contingent expenses of the several Executive Departments or other Government establishments to which this section shall apply.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order upon this section.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to that section.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the point of order until an explanation can be made.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Chairman, in the preparation of the appropriation bill the fact appeared that there is in every Department of the Government and in some of the bureaus of some of the Departments miscellaneous libraries, libraries of fiction